


UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 00722549 3






Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto

by

Bertram A. Davis
from the books of the
late Lionel Davis, K.C.



THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND

Seventy-five years have passed since Lingard completed his HISTORY OF ENGLAND, which ends with the Revolution of 1688. During that period historical study has made a great advance. Year after year the mass of materials for a new History of England has increased; new lights have been thrown on events and characters, and old errors have been corrected. Many notable works have been written on various periods of our history; some of them at such length as to appeal almost exclusively to professed historical students. It is believed that the time has come when the advance which has been made in the knowledge of English history as a whole should be laid before the public in a single work of fairly adequate size. Such a book should be founded on independent thought and research, but should at the same time be written with a full knowledge of the works of the best modern historians and with a desire to take advantage of their teaching wherever it appears sound.

The vast number of authorities, printed and in manuscript, on which a History of England should be based, if it is to represent the existing state of knowledge, renders co-operation almost necessary and certainly advisable. The History, of which this volume is an instalment, is an attempt to set forth in a readable form the results at present attained by research. It will consist of twelve volumes by twelve different writers, each

of them chosen as being specially capable of dealing with the period which he undertakes, and the editors, while leaving to each author as free a hand as possible, hope to insure a general similarity in method of treatment, so that the twelve volumes may in their contents, as well as in their outward appearance, form one History.

As its title imports, this History will primarily deal with politics, with the History of England and, after the date of the union with Scotland, Great Britain, as a state or body politic; but as the life of a nation is complex, and its condition at any given time cannot be understood without taking into account the various forces acting upon it, notices of religious matters and of intellectual, social, and economic progress will also find place in these volumes. The footnotes will, so far as is possible, be confined to references to authorities, and references will not be appended to statements which appear to be matters of common knowledge and do not call for support. Each volume will have an Appendix giving some account of the chief authorities, original and secondary, which the author has used. This account will be compiled with a view of helping students rather than of making long lists of books without any notes as to their contents or value. That the History will have faults both of its own and such as will always in some measure attend co-operative work, must be expected, but no pains have been spared to make it, so far as may be, not wholly unworthy of the greatness of its subject.

Each volume, while forming part of a complete History, will also in itself be a separate and complete book, will be sold separately, and will have its own index, and two or more maps.

III

The History is divided as follows :—

- Vol. I. FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE NORMAN CONQUEST (to 1066). By Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L., Litt.D., Fellow of University College, London; late Fellow of the British Academy. With 2 Maps.
- Vol. II. FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO THE DEATH OF JOHN (1066-1216). By George Burton Adams, D.D., Litt.D., Professor of History in Yale University. With 2 Maps.
- Vol. III. FROM THE ACCESSION OF HENRY III. TO THE DEATH OF EDWARD III. (1216-1377). By T. F. Tout, M.A., Professor of History and Director of Advanced Study in History in the University of Manchester; Fellow of the British Academy. With 3 Maps.
- Vol. IV. FROM THE ACCESSION OF RICHARD II. TO THE DEATH OF RICHARD III. (1377-1485). By Sir C. W. C. Oman, K.B.E., M.A., LL.D., M.P., Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford; Fellow of the British Academy. With 3 Maps.
- Vol. V. FROM THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VII. TO THE DEATH OF HENRY VIII. (1485-1547). By the Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, M.A., M.P., President of the Board of Education; Fellow of the British Academy. With 2 Maps.
- Vol. VI. FROM THE ACCESSION OF EDWARD VI. TO THE DEATH OF ELIZABETH (1547-1603). By A. F. Pollard, M.A., Litt.D., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, and Professor of English History in the University of London. With 2 Maps.
- Vol. VII. FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES I. TO THE RESTORATION (1603-1660). By F. C. Montague, M.A., Astor Professor of History in University College, London; formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. With 3 Maps.

[Continued on next page.]

Vol. VIII. FROM THE RESTORATION TO THE DEATH OF WILLIAM III. (1660-1702). By Sir Richard Lodge, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of History in the University of Edinburgh; formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. With 2 Maps.

Vol. IX. FROM THE ACCESSION OF ANNE TO THE DEATH OF GEORGE II. (1702-1760). By I. S. Leadam, M.A., formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. With 8 Maps.

Vol. X. FROM THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE III. TO THE CLOSE OF PITT'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION (1760-1801). By the Rev. William Hunt, M.A., D.Litt., Trinity College, Oxford. With 3 Maps.

Vol. XI. FROM ADDINGTON'S ADMINISTRATION TO THE CLOSE OF WILLIAM IV.'S REIGN (1801-1837). By the Hon. George C. Brodrick, D.C.L., late Warden of Merton College, Oxford, and J. K. Fotheringham, M.A., D.Litt., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford; Lecturer in Ancient History at King's College, London. With 3 Maps.

Vol. XII. THE REIGN OF QUEEN VICTORIA (1837-1901). By Sir Sidney Low, M.A., Fellow of King's College, London; formerly Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford, and Lloyd C. Sanders, B.A. With 3 Maps.

The Political History of England

IN TWELVE VOLUMES

EDITED BY WILLIAM HUNT, D.LITT., AND
REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A., LL.D., LITT.D.

IV.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND
FROM THE ACCESSION OF RICHARD II. TO
THE DEATH OF RICHARD III.

1377-1485



HE
H 21666
H 444

THE

HISTORY OF ENGLAND

FROM THE ACCESSION OF RICHARD II. TO
THE DEATH OF RICHARD III.

(1377-1485)

BY

SIR CHARLES OMAN

K.B.E., M.P., M.A. OXON., HON. LL.D. EDIN.

CHICHELE PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

NEW IMPRESSION

H 21666
H 444

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

1920

DA
235
06
cop 2.3

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE FRENCH WAR.

	PAGE
21 June, 1377. Death of Edward III.	1
19 July. End of the rule of Lancaster: the first council of Richard II.	3
1377-78. The naval crisis	5
13 Oct., 1377. First parliament of Richard II.	7
Aug.-Sept., 1378. Siege of St. Malo	11
11 Aug. The Westminster sacrilege	13
20 Oct. The parliament of Gloucester	15
1379. The poll tax of 1379	17
July-Oct., 1380. Buckingham's invasion of France	19
5 Nov. The parliament of Northampton and the great poll tax	21

CHAPTER II.

THE GREAT REBELLION OF 1381.

1381. Social condition of England: causes of the rebellion	26
30 May. The first outbreak at Brentwood	33
2 June. Kent rises: appearance of Wat Tyler	34
John Ball and his preaching	36
12. The Kentish rebels at Blackheath	37
13. Wat Tyler enters London	39
14. The Mile-end conference: murder of Archbishop Sud- bury: anarchy in London	41
15. Richard II. at Smithfield: death of Tyler	46
16-30. Suppression of the rebellion in London, Essex, and Kent	49
12-24. Course of the rebellion in East Anglia: Bishop De- spenser's campaign	53
June-July. The rebellion in the outlying counties	60
13 Nov. The parliament of 1381 and its proceedings	62
Results of the rebellion	63

CHAPTER III.

LAST YEARS OF THE MINORITY OF RICHARD II., WYCLIFFE AND THE
FLEMISH CRUSADE.

	PAGE
14 Jan., 1382. Marriage of Richard to Anne of Bohemia	66
Michael de la Pole and his policy	67
Wycliffe and his teaching	68 ✓
17 May. Archbishop Courtenay's attack on Wycliffe: the synod of Blackfriars	75 ✓
June-Oct. Trials of the followers of Wycliffe	77 ✓
28 Dec., 1383. Death of Wycliffe	80 ✓
27 Nov., 1382. The troubles of Flanders: battle of Roosebeke	82
6 Dec. Bishop Despenser preaches his crusade	83 ✓
April-Sept., 1383. Despenser in Flanders: his disastrous campaign	84 ✓

CHAPTER IV.

THE KING AND THE LORDS APPELLANT.

	De la Pole as chancellor: the king's friends: Robert de Vere	87
29 April, 1384.	The parliament of Salisbury: affair of the Carmelite friar John Latimer	90 ✓
Feb., 1385.	Quarrel of the king and Lancaster	93
20 July.	Richard's invasion of Scotland	95
20 Oct.	Parliament of 1385: Archbishop Courtenay and the Commons	97 ✓
7 July, 1386.	Lancaster departs to Spain	99
Sept.-Nov.	Projected French invasion of England	100
1 Oct.	Richard quarrels with his parliament	101
25 Aug., 1387.	The "Opinions of Nottingham": Richard prepares for civil war	104
12 Nov.	Rising of the Lords Appellant	106
20 Dec.	Combat of Radcot Bridge: flight of Oxford and Suf- folk	108
3 Feb., 1388.	The "merciless parliament": trials and execution of the king's friends.	109

CHAPTER V.

THE KING'S REVENGE.

15 Aug., 1388.	Battle of Otterbourne	114
May, 1389.	Richard displaces the ministers	116
Nov.	John of Gaunt concludes Spanish campaign and re- turns to England	117
1390-92.	Ministry of Wykeham: the quiet years	119
1393-94.	Quarrel of Lancaster and Arundel	122
1389-94.	Persecution of the Lollards	123 ✓
7 June, 1394.	Death of Queen Anne	125

	PAGE
Sept., 1394-May, 1395. Richard's first Irish expedition	126
Oct.-4 Nov., 1396. Peace with France: Richard marries Isabella, daughter of Charles VI.	129
Jan.-Feb., 1397. Parliament of 1397; Haxey's case	132
10 July. The king's revenge upon the Lords Appellant: arrest of Gloucester, Arundel, and Warwick	133
9 Sept. Murder of Gloucester	135
Sept. Execution of Arundel; imprisonment of War- wick	136

CHAPTER VI.

THE TRIUMPH OF HENRY OF LANCASTER.

Jan., 1398. The parliament of Shrewsbury and the "parlia- mentary committee"	139
30 Jan.-16 Sept. Quarrel of Hereford and Norfolk: the king ban- ishes both	141
1398-99. Tyranny of the king	144
May, 1399. Richard's second Irish expedition	145
4 July. Henry of Lancaster lands at Ravenspur	147
July-Aug. General rebellion: the king's friends executed	148
14 Aug. Richard returns from Ireland and surrenders to Henry	149
29 Sept. Abdication of Richard	151
30. Election of Henry of Lancaster as king	152

CHAPTER VII.

REIGN OF HENRY IV. THE EARLY TROUBLES.

Character of Henry IV.	155
6 Oct., 1399. The first Lancastrian parliament	156
Dec. Conspiracy of the four earls	160
8 Jan., 1400. The slaughter at Cirencester	163
14 Feb. Murder of Richard II.	165
Aug.-Sept. Rising of Owen Glendower	168
11 Mar., 1401. The statute <i>De heretico comburendo</i>	171
1 Oct. The king's second expedition against Glendower	173
3 April, 1402. Henry marries Joan of Navarre	174
May. Appearance of the "false Richard" in Scotland	175
14 Sept. Homildon Hill	177
July, 1403. Glendower conquers South Wales	178
21. Rebellion of the Percies: battle of Shrewsbury	180
Aug.-Dec. War with France	184

CHAPTER VIII.

HENRY IV. AND HIS PARLIAMENTS.

14 Jan., 1404. First parliament of 1404: the king's financial em- barrassments	186
10 May. Glendower makes alliance with France	190

	PAGE
6 Oct. The "unlearned parliament"	190
13 Feb., 1405. Lady Despenser's plot	193
May. Rebellion and death of Scrope and Nottingham	194 ✓
Aug.-Nov. The French in Wales	199
Mar.-Dec., 1406. Sessions of the "long parliament"	201
30 Mar. Capture of James of Scotland.	203
Oct. Henry accepts the "thirty-one articles"	207 ✓
Successes of Prince Henry against Glendower	203
20 Oct., 1407. Parliament of Gloucester	210
19 Feb., 1408. Battle of Bramham Moor	211
Dec., 1408-Jan., 1409. Fall of Harlech and Aberystwith	213

CHAPTER IX.

✓ THE LAST YEARS OF HENRY IV.

1409. The king's illness	214
1409-13. Contest for power between the factions of Prince Henry and Archbishop Arundel	215 ✓
The three Beauforts	218
April, 1409. Strife of Arundel and the University of Oxford	221
5 Mar., 1410. The Lollards: martyrdom of Badby	222 ✓
July, 1410-Nov., 1411. Alliance with John of Burgundy, and expedition to France	224
Aug., 1412. Alliance with the Orleanists, second expedition to France	226
Reconciliation of the king and Prince Henry.	227
20 Mar., 1413. Death of Henry IV.	229

CHAPTER X.

✓ ST. GILES'S FIELDS AND AGINCOURT.

Character of Henry V.	231
1413. Persecution of the Lollards, arrest and escape of Old- castle	233 ✓
Jan., 1414. Oldcastle's insurrection	237 ✓
31 May. Henry prepares to attack France	240
1 Aug., 1415. Cambridge's conspiracy	245
13 Aug.-22 Sept. Siege and capture of Harfleur	247
25 Oct. Battle of Agincourt.	252
16 Nov. The king returns to England	258

CHAPTER XI.

THE CONQUEST OF NORMANDY AND THE TREATY OF TROYES.

1 May, 1416. Visit of the Emperor Sigismund to England	262
1417. Condition of France: Burgundians and Armagnacs	263
20 Sept. Henry invades Normandy: he takes Caen, etc.	265
14 Dec. Capture and execution of Oldcastle	267 ✓

	PAGE
July, 1418-Jan., 1419. Siege and capture of Rouen	269
9 Sept., 1419. Murder of John of Burgundy by the Dauphin	275
21 May, 1420. Philip of Burgundy joins the English: treaty of Troyes	276
Christmas. Henry in Paris	279
22 Mar., 1421. Battle of Baugé	280
July, 1421-Mar., 1422. Last campaign of Henry V.: siege of Meaux	282
31 Aug., 1422. Death of the king	285

CHAPTER XII.

THE EARLY YEARS OF HENRY VI.

	The Dukes of Bedford and Gloucester	288
1 Aug., 1423. Battle of Cravant		291
Mar. Gloucester's quarrel with Burgundy: Jacquelin of Hainault		292
21 Nov. Release of James of Scotland		293
17 Aug., 1424. Battle of Verneuil		295
Oct., 1425. Strife of Gloucester and Cardinal Beaufort		296
Feb., 1426. The "parliament of bats"		299
12 Oct., 1428. Commencement of the siege of Orleans		302

CHAPTER XIII.

FROM THE APPEARANCE OF JEANNE DARC TO THE TREATY OF ARRAS.

6 Mar., 1429. Jeanne Darc at Chinon	304
3 May. Jeanne raises the siege of Orleans	307
19 June. Battle of Patay	308
17 July. Jeanne crowns Charles VII. at Reims	309
8 Sept. Repulse of the French before Paris	310
23 May, 1430. Capture of Jeanne at Compiègne	314
29 May, 1431. Trial and martyrdom of Jeanne	315
1431-34. Waning fortunes of the English in France	318
6 Sept., 1435. Conference of Arras: the English reject peace	322

CHAPTER XIV.

THE LOSS OF FRANCE.

April, 1436. Paris recovered by the French	326
July. James I. of Scotland at war with England.	327
1437-40. Loss of the outlying fortresses in France	328
1440. Release of the Duke of Orleans	331
Oct.-Nov., 1441. Trial and condemnation of the Duchess of Gloucester	333
Aug.-Dec., 1443. John Duke of Somerset's campaign in France	334
1444-45. Peace negotiation with France: Henry VI. marries Margaret of Anjou	334
Character of Henry VI.	336
23 Feb., 1447. Arrest and death of Humphrey of Gloucester	338

	PAGE
1447-48. Negotiations about the cession of Le Mans . . .	340
24 Mar., 1449. Renewal of the French war: loss of Rouen and Eastern Normandy	341
15 April, 1450. Battle of Formigny	343
24 June. Edmund Duke of Somerset surrenders Caen: all Normandy lost	344

CHAPTER XV.

THE OUTBREAK OF THE WARS OF THE ROSES.

26 Jan.-2 May, 1450. Impeachment and murder of Suffolk . . .	345
June-July. Jack Cade's rebellion	347
Aug.-Dec. Richard of York puts himself at the head of the opposition	351
Causes of the Wars of the Roses	352
1451-53. The final struggle in Guienne: Battle of Castillon .	358
Aug., 1453. Henry VI. becomes insane: first regency of York .	361
25 Dec., 1454. The king restored to health: he replaces Somerset in favour	364
22 May, 1455. York takes arms: first battle of St. Albans . . .	366

CHAPTER XVI.

FROM THE FIRST BATTLE OF ST. ALBANS TO THE BATTLE OF WAKEFIELD.

May, 1455-Oct., 1456. Second regency of York: disturbed state of Eng- land	369
Oct., 1456. York dismissed from power: the queen's rule . . .	371
1455-58. Richard Earl of Warwick in command at Calais, and admiral: his exploits	375
Trial and condemnation of Bishop Pecock	377
22 Sept., 1459. Second outbreak of civil war: battle at Blore Heath	380
13 Oct. Rout of Ludford: the Yorkists in exile	383
20 Nov. Parliament of Coventry: attainder of the Yorkists	385
Nov., 1459-June, 1460. Warwick at Calais: he invades England and captures London	386
10 July, 1460. Battle of Northampton	392
31 Oct. York claims the crown: he is recognised as heir to Henry VI.	395
30 Dec. Battle of Wakefield: York slain	398

CHAPTER XVII.

FROM WAKEFIELD TO HEXHAM: THE ASCENDENCY OF THE EARL OF
WARWICK.

Character of Warwick, "the king-maker"	400
17 Feb., 1461. Second battle of St. Albans	402
4 Mar. Edward IV. proclaimed king	404

	PAGE
29. Battle of Towton	407
4 Nov. First parliament of Edward IV.: attainder of the Lancastrians	410
April, 1462. Queen Margaret invades Northumberland . . .	413
1462-64. Warwick's northern campaigns: conquest and re conquest of the north	414
15 May, 1464. Battle of Hexham: end of the civil war . . .	417

CHAPTER XVIII.

EDWARD IV. AND THE EARL OF WARWICK.

	Character of Edward IV.	419
1 May, 1464.	His marriage to Elizabeth Woodville	420
1464-65.	Preferment of the queen's relatives: estrangement of Edward and Warwick	422
July, 1466.	Capture and imprisonment of Henry VI.	425
8 June, 1467.	The king breaks with Warwick	428
June, 1469.	Warwick's plots: rebellion of Robin of Redesdale .	431
26 July.	Battle of Edgcott	434
July, 1469-Mar., 1470.	Edward in the power of Warwick	434
Mar., 1470.	The Lincolnshire rebellion: Edward expels War- wick from England	436
4 Aug.	Reconciliation of Warwick and Queen Margaret .	439
Sept.	Warwick reconquers England and restores Henry VI.	440
Mar., 1471.	Edward invades England	441
14 April.	Battle of Barnet: Warwick slain	443
3 May.	Battle of Tewkesbury	447
21.	Murder of Henry VI.	449

CHAPTER XIX.

THE LATER YEARS OF EDWARD IV.

	Autocracy of Edward IV.: its limitations . . .	450
1472.	Alliance with Burgundy	454
1473.	Edward and the Hansa	455
29 Aug., 1475.	Invasion of France and Treaty of Picquigny . .	456
1477-78.	Quarrel of the king and Clarence	460
17 Feb., 1478.	Trial and murder of Clarence	462
1480-82.	Edward's Scottish war	464
9 April, 1483.	Rupture with France: death of the king. . . .	468
	The court of Edward IV. and the New Learning .	469

CHAPTER XX.

THE FALL OF THE HOUSE OF YORK.

April-May, 1483.	State of affairs at the death of Edward IV. . . .	471
May-June.	Richard of Gloucester arrests the queen's relatives and makes himself protector	473

	PAGE
13 June. Execution of Lord Hastings	477
28 June-6 July. Usurpation of Richard III.: his coronation . .	478
15 July? Murder of the princes in the Tower	481
Oct.-Nov. Buckingham's rebellion	482
23 Jan., 1484. Parliament of 1484	486
9 April. Death of Prince Edward	487
1484-85. Plots against the king	488
16 Mar., 1485. Death of Queen Anne: the Princess Elizabeth . .	490
7 Aug. Henry Tudor invades England	492
22 Aug. Battle of Bosworth	493
APPENDIX I. On Authorities	497
II. Genealogies:—	
(1) The houses of Lancaster, Beaufort, and Holland.	
(2) The houses of York, Mortimer, Buekingham, and	
Bourchier <i>To face p. 512</i>	

MAPS.

(AT THE END OF THE VOLUME.)

1. England under the house of Lancaster.
2. France at the greatest extension of the English power, 1428-29.
3. Plans of Agincourt, Towton, Barnet, and Tewkesbury.

CHAPTER I.

THE FRENCH WAR.

ON Sunday, June 21, 1377, died Edward, third of that name since the Conquest, in unhonoured old age. Long ere he passed away the victor of Halidon and Sluys and Crecy had sunk into a feeble and facile dotard, the victim of venal courtiers and a greedy mistress, and the tool of his eldest surviving son, the ambitious but incompetent Duke of Lancaster. He left his realm involved in a bitter constitutional struggle at home, and a disastrous war abroad. There had been many who feared that his death would be the signal for the outbreak of an even worse evil, civil strife over the succession to the crown. The numerous enemies of John of Gaunt were convinced that the duke was watching his opportunity to thrust aside his little nephew, Richard Prince of Wales, and to lay claim to the throne. He was in possession of the position—if not the title—of regent: he had just succeeded in crushing the political enemies who had pressed him so hard in the “good parliament” of 1376. Speaker De la Mare was still in prison; Bishop Wykeham had been compelled to humble himself, and to sue, through a most undignified channel,¹ for the restoration of his temporalities; the Earl of March and the other peers who had supported the popular party had been deprived of office and excluded from the council. But John of Lancaster, with all his faults, was not a scheming villain of the type of his great-nephew, Richard of Gloucester. Arrogant, self-willed, hasty in word and deed, he might be; but he was loyal, so far as his lights served him, to the knightly ethics of his age, and nothing

CHAP.
I.

¹ The mediation of Alice Perrers, who induced the old king to pardon Wykeham, though Lancaster still retained a rancorous feeling against him (*Chron. Angl.*, pp. 136-37).

CHAP. I. was farther from his thoughts than usurpation. While his father yet lived, he had declared with great emphasis that he owned his nephew as the rightful heir to the throne, and he had paraded the child before the subservient Lancastrian parliament of the preceding January as the "lieutenant of the king". That this was no mere hypocritical show was made sufficiently manifest by his behaviour when the life of Edward III. at last flickered out. The change in sovereigns meant everything to him; his domination had come to an end, and he was well aware that those who stood nearest to his young nephew loved him not. Yet he accepted the situation with unimpeachable good faith, though it involved the reversal of all his policy, and the surrender of his cherished enmities. Two days after his father's death he was formally reconciled, at the express entreaty of the young king, to his old foes the citizens of London. A few days later he assented to the complete pardon of the Bishop of Winchester; immediately after he witnessed without protest the release of Speaker De la Mare, who entered London in triumph after nine weary months spent in Nottingham Castle.

The rule of Lancaster was ended; it remained to be seen who would receive over the government of England from his hands. Richard II. himself was still too young to count as a factor in the situation, save indeed that his forlorn youth appealed to the sympathy of all his subjects. He was a well-grown boy of ten, with finely cut features and a mass of curling golden hair. The hereditary beauty of the Plantagenets was all his own; a chronicler who saw him on his coronation day compares him to Absalom;¹ and indeed he was well fitted to "steal away the heart of the people," well fitted also in after days to lose what he had won by wayward petulance and overweening self-confidence like his scriptural prototype. Richard had been kept hitherto under the close care of his mother, for his father, the Black Prince, long a broken invalid, seems to have had little to do with his rearing. The Princess of Wales was a lady of whom no man could speak any ill—unless indeed he was malicious enough to refer to her early matrimonial infelicities with William of Salisbury. She was a

¹ Adam of Usk, p. 1.

lover of peace, a reconciler of enemies, a ready friend of the unfortunate. Her influence was always exerted on the side of wisdom and moderation, and at the moment of her son's accession she gave proof of her good sense by accepting frankly the loyal protestations of John of Gaunt, and refraining from any attempt to raise up a party against him. Nothing could have been more easy than to take the other course: there were old enemies of the duke who would have been only too happy to combine for such a purpose, if the chance had been given them. To complete the picture of this amiable, if not very forcible, princess, we must add that she was decidedly inclined to favour the reformer John Wycliffe. Sir Lewis Clifford and certain other of the knights of her household were avowed Lollards.

CHAP.
I.

The king was crowned on July 16; three days later the names of the council which was to administer the realm for him were published. Lancaster did not appear in the list; he had known long before that he would be excluded, but by the compromise and pacification made immediately on the death of his father it had been provided that he should be represented by several of his partisans among the twelve councillors. His private chancellor, Bishop Erghum of Salisbury, his allies, Richard Earl of Arundel and Lord Latimer, faced his foes Bishop Courtenay of London and the Earl of March. In short, the council was a sort of "coalition ministry," in which the court party and the constitutional party were both represented. Its creation bears witness to an honest endeavour at patriotic self-restraint on either side. But such a body was ill-calculated for the deliverance of England from the complicated evils which beset her at the moment. Not only were the political views of its members too heterogeneous to be easily reconciled, but they themselves were individually lacking alike in insight and in force. The best that could be hoped of such a body was that it might—to use the words of a modern politician—"muddle along somehow" through the dangers that lay immediately ahead.

The chief of these was the disastrous French war, now more threatening than ever in appearance. The struggle which had commenced with the rupture of the treaty of Calais in 1369 was now in its eighth year. There had been a short truce in

CHAP. I. 1376-77, while John of Gaunt had been carrying out his fruitless negotiations at Bruges. But the armistice had run out on April 1, 1377, twelve weeks before the accession of Richard II., and the enemy had resumed operations in the most vigorous style.

The war had become essentially defensive in character. It differed entirely from the old struggle of 1337-60, when Edward III., having gained the command of the seas at Sluys, attacked any point of France that he chose, conquering and to conquer. Now, since the failure of John of Gaunt's great raid of 1373, the English in France had been standing at bay, vainly endeavouring to defend the ever-shrinking border of the duchy of Aquitaine. It was but a remnant of the old heritage of Eleanor of Guienne that remained; Bergerac on the Dordogne was the farthest fortress in the inland that acknowledged the suzerainty of Richard II. There was still a solid block of loyal towns around Bordeaux,—their ever-faithful elder sister—Mortagne, Blaye, Bourg, Libourne, Sauveterre, St. Macaire. But this patch on the Gironde was connected with the other group of English fortresses only by a narrow slip along the sea-coast, amid the desolate pine forests of the Landes. When this was passed, there was a broader stretch of territory still intact, extending from the great harbour-fortress of Bayonne as far as Dax and the borders of Navarre. But all the great barons of the Gascon inland, headed by the Count of Armagnac and the Lord of Albret, had long passed over to the French side. Thus the frontier presented by the duchy of Aquitaine was very weak; it had length but no depth, and could not have been maintained for a moment, but for the fact that it was covered by many strong castles and fortified towns, against which the siegecraft of the fourteenth century could only work very slowly. It seemed probable that a few more summers would suffice to place even these last strongholds in the hands of the Constable Bertrand du Guesclin and the mercenary bands of Charles V. Outside Aquitaine there remained, of all the former possessions of Edward III., only the single stronghold of Calais and its dependent forts. But strong in its girdle of marshes, and easily succoured from Dover, the great gate of entry into northern France seemed likely to be preserved long after Bordeaux and Bayonne should have passed away to the enemy.

Threatening, hopeless indeed, as was the condition of affairs in Aquitaine, this was not for the moment the greatest peril which the council of Richard II. had to face. The naval danger was the really pressing one ; the command of the sea had been lost as far back as 1372, when the fleet of the Earl of Pembroke had been defeated off La Rochelle by the allied navies of France and Castile. Since then the dominion of the narrow seas had completely disappeared. It was no longer possible to communicate freely with Bordeaux and Bayonne ; it was not even safe to reckon on an undisturbed voyage down the Channel. This state of affairs was the direct result of the Black Prince's unhappy interference in the domestic politics of Spain. By espousing the unlucky cause of Pedro the Cruel, he had made the house of Trastamara the bitter enemy of England. Castile was a strong naval power, and when its fleet was added to that of France they were too powerful for the English navy. The best policy for England to pursue at this moment would undoubtedly have been to make peace at any price with the King of Castile. If his ships had been withdrawn, it would have been possible to face the French navy on equal terms. But unfortunately a reconciliation with Enrique of Trastamara was impracticable, because an English prince was at this moment claiming the bastard's crown. John of Gaunt had married Constance, the eldest surviving daughter of Pedro the Cruel, and on the murder of his father-in-law had proclaimed himself and his wife King and Queen of Castile and Leon. He had Spanish followers about his court, who were always intriguing with the surviving partisans of their late king. Unless Lancaster would surrender his pretensions it was impossible to obtain peace from King Enrique. The duke had no such self-denying intentions ; on the contrary, he was hoping, with the aid of the King of Portugal and the Castilian malcontents, to renew the attack on the house of Trastamara. His view of the situation was that it would be to the interest of the English government to make him King of Castile, and he was not easily to be persuaded that the wiser course would be to abandon his claims, and make peace at all costs with Don Enrique.

In the year of Richard's accession the naval war had reached an absolutely disastrous stage. The very voyage from Dover to Calais was perilous ; the Boulogne privateers had been captur-

CHAP. I. ing English vessels only a few bowshots outside Calais harbour. The Yarmouth fishing fleet had been attacked as it toiled on the Dogger Bank, and had barely escaped destruction. A few days only after Richard had mounted the throne there had been a series of mishaps on the south coast such as England had never seen before. The French admiral Jean de Vienne, and his Castilian colleague Ferran Sanchez de Tovar, not contented with sweeping the Channel, had taken to conducting serious land operations in Kent and Sussex. They sacked Rye, on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, ravaged the Isle of Wight in August, and then burnt Hastings, and routed in battle the prior of Lewes, who led against them the shire levies of Sussex, when their proper chief, the Earl of Arundel, fled to take refuge at London. Finally they made a daring raid into the estuary of the Thames, and surprised Gravesend, before they sailed home to divide their spoils.

Disastrous as were the opening months of King Richard's reign on this side of the Channel, they were no less unfortunate in Aquitaine. In July the Duke of Anjou, the eldest brother of Charles V., gathered a large army in Poitou, marched into Perigord and laid siege to Bergerac, the last town in that province which still remained in English hands. The garrison held out gallantly, and asked succour from Bordeaux. Sir Thomas Felton, the seneschal of Aquitaine, though he could gather no larger a force than 300 lances, thought himself in honour bound to do something to raise the leaguer. On September 1 he fell upon a French convoy which was bringing up siege-engines to reinforce Anjou's battering train. But the escort was too strong for him; he was defeated and captured, and with him four great lords of Gascony, the mainstays of the English party in the duchy. The garrison of Bergerac surrendered next day.

The ministers had to report a tale of unbroken disaster to the first parliament of Richard II., which was summoned to meet at Westminster on October 13. In spirit this assembly was the legitimate successor of the "good parliament" of April, 1376. It was strongly anti-Lancastrian in feeling, and met with a steadfast determination of reversing all the doings of John of Gaunt's packed parliament of January, 1377, and harking back to all the reforms that had been mooted in the previous year. If it had not been that the realm was in serious danger

of foreign invasion, and had there not been a genuine desire to spare the young king all possible trouble, the reaction would have been even more violent. The Commons began by re-electing as their Speaker the newly-released prisoner Sir Peter De la Mare, the hero of the "good parliament". But they displayed also much self-restraint in refraining from any personal retaliation against Lancaster, and named him first among the usual list of peers whose advice they declared themselves desirous of receiving. He was also permitted on the first day of the session to make a solemn assertion of his loyalty, none dissenting or objecting.¹ CHAP. 1.

But however confident they might be that Lancaster was no traitor at heart, his opponents were resolved to reverse his doings in the parliament of the last spring, and to dislodge his adherents from the ministry. They began by addressing three petitions to the crown. The first was for the remodelling of the council, some of whose members, as they said, failed to inspire them with confidence. The second was for the nomination of new personal attendants for the young king. The third was the highly important constitutional claim that "no act made in parliament should be repealed save by the consent of parliament"—a direct challenge of Lancaster's unconstitutional conduct in quashing the proceedings of the "good parliament" by royal edict in the preceding year. The council yielded with a facility that showed its conscious weakness. It consented to reform itself at the demand of the Commons. The young king was brought forward to announce that he had dispensed with the services of Lord Latimer, the most unscrupulous and unpopular of Lancaster's nominees, of the Earl of Arundel, who was in public disfavour for his real or supposed cowardice during the French invasion of Sussex, and three other members, all of Lancastrian tendencies; they were to be replaced by the Earl of Stafford and two other new councillors. Richard was also instructed to declare that he willingly pledged his word that for the future no act of parliament should ever be repealed without parliament's consent.

Satisfied with their victory as regards these two important points, the Commons made the king the liberal grant of two

¹ *Rot. Parl.*, iii., 5.

CHAP. I. fifteenths, to which the clergy added the still more generous gift of two tenths. But the house annexed conditions to the supply : the money was not to be considered as ordinary revenue, but to be treated as a special contribution for the war, and administered by two treasurers appointed *ad hoc*. It was added that for the future the king ought to refrain from burdening the people with such heavy taxes ; he could "live of his own" and maintain the war from his ancient and regular income, if only he were provided with capable and economical ministers¹—a statement which, unhappily, was very far from being correct. The disastrous struggle with France could not possibly have been kept up on the old feudal revenues of the crown and the proceeds of the customs.

Richard's advisers were so glad to get the money, and so eager to show that they wished honestly to spend it on the war and nothing else, that they made no objection either to the conditions imposed or the lecture that accompanied them. They gave pledge of their good faith by appointing as the war-treasurers William Walworth and John Philpot, two leading citizens of London. Finding the ministry in such a yielding mood, the Commons now presented a supplementary petition, to the effect that they thought it desirable that the chancellor, treasurer, and other great officers of state should be appointed by parliament. Even this enormous encroachment upon the ancient prerogative of the crown was submitted to without a murmur. The king was made to grant the petition, and for some time the arrangement was actually carried out. Two more points remain to be noted in the proceedings of the two houses in November, 1377. A petition was made and granted that no person who had been impeached or attainted by parliament should ever be appointed to the royal council—a personal blow at Lancaster's *protégé* Lord Latimer. Lastly, Alice Perrers was tried by the peers, and sentenced to perpetual banishment from court, and to forfeiture of all the lands or money which she had wrung from the senile infatuation of Edward III.

So ended the proceedings of this most important parliament, wherein the anti-Lancastrian party appeared to have won a com-

¹ De suis vivat, et continuet werram suam : bona propria sibi sufficiunt, tam ad regiae domus exhibitionem quam ad werrae sustentacionem, si eadem bona ministros idoneos sortiantur (*Chron. Angl.*, p. 171).

plete and permanent victory. They had recast the *personnel* of the council, established their control over the great ministers of the crown, and vindicated their right of appropriating grants for objects to be designated by themselves. John of Gaunt had bowed before the storm; he had made no protest, save that in defence of his own personal loyalty, and had allowed his adherents to be swept out of office. At the termination of the session he retired to his estates, and for many months refrained from interfering in any affairs of state. It would appear that he was loyally attempting to live down the charge that he had aimed at a dictatorship, or even at the crown itself. CHAP. I.

The newly recast council would seem to have been divided in opinion as to the best way of conducting the war. They halted between the two views which have again and again been urged in various centuries, when the defence of the kingdom is in question, and which crop up even now when soldiers and sailors discuss that problem. Is it true that "the best defensive is a vigorous offensive"—that England should ward off attacks on her own shores by throwing all her strength into her navy and carrying the war into the enemy's waters? Or should she think of her ill-protected harbours and her long exposed lines of coast, and devote part of her energies to fortification and land defence? Remembering what had happened during the last summer in Sussex and the Isle of Wight, some councillors urged the importance of being prepared at home. Others pointed out, with a good deal of reason, that prevention is better than cure, that if only there had been a strong English fleet at sea in the preceding July, the French and Castilians would never have ventured to throw ashore large landing forces, which would have been lost if their squadron had been defeated.

A compromise was the natural result of this conflict of opinions. A good deal of money was set aside for strengthening fortifications both in England and in Guienne,¹ and the towns of the south coast were urged in addition to do all that they could for their own protection. Even places so far inland as Oxford received, in February, 1378, letters from the council to bid them strengthen their defences, in view of the French raids of the previous year. But the greater part of the parlia-

¹ In the parliament of Oct., 1378, Walworth and Philpot accounted for £46,000 spent on fortresses out of the war-grant (*Rot. Parl.*, iii., 36).

CHAP. I. mentary grant was set aside for the raising of a fleet, which was to sweep the French and Castilians from the seas. The command of this naval armament was given to John of Gaunt, in spite of his general unpopularity, and of the care which the late parliament had taken to exclude his partisans from the council.

Whatever may have been the secret explanation of such a step, the charge of the Channel fleet was assigned to Duke John in the end of February, and the contingents were directed to muster in March. But they were presently informed that their setting forth would not be till Midsummer Day. This long delay, for which the duke was bitterly blamed, was mainly due to the rise of new political complications in France, which had to be taken into consideration before the precise movements of the fleet could be determined. The first of these unexpected developments was an offer from the Duke of Brittany to put into English hands Brest, the one great fortress of his duchy which still remained faithful to him. John of Montfort had suffered bitterly for his alliance with England; he was at the present moment in exile, and, in despair of reconquering his dominions by his own sword, he offered in April to cede his last foothold in them, receiving in return Castle Rising and certain other royal manors. Brest, on its rugged peninsula with its impregnable castle and its two great harbours, was a splendid base for attacks on western France, a second Calais. But an even more important political event distracted the attention of the English council to Normandy. Charles the Bad, King of Navarre, had long been in possession of the county of Evreux and other Norman fiefs, in the right of his wife. His cousin of France, anxious to get them into his own hands, declared that he had detected their owner intriguing with the English¹ and Flemings, and plotting against his own life by poison. Assailed before he could make preparation for defence, Charles the Bad saw his inland lordships overrun by the Constable du Guesclin in April and May, 1378. But the

¹ The intrigues with England were probably genuine. The papers seized in the possession of the Navarrese agent Jacques de Rue are said to have contained a project for the marriage of Charles's son Pierre to Katharine of Lancaster. The assassination plot was probably a fiction to throw odium on the king. See *Chronique des Quatre Premiers Valois*, p. 265; and Froissart, ix., 55.

harbour-fortress of Cherbourg still remained, and this he offered to surrender to England. It was to be leased for three years, and in return the council covenanted to succour him with 1,000 lances and 2,000 archers. These troops were to be used, not in Normandy, where Charles's fiefs were hopelessly lost, but in Navarre itself, which was threatened both by the French and by their ally the King of Castile.

CHAP.
I.

Thus the projected English operations of 1378 were complicated by the introduction of two new factors. Troops had to be distracted from the main armament, not only to garrison Brest and Cherbourg, but also to furnish the succours to Bordeaux, which were ultimately to be used to aid the King of Navarre on the Pyrenean frontier. Nevertheless, a considerable fleet remained under Lancaster's command, and with it he sailed out from Dover and Sandwich at the end of June, determined to bring the French to action. He sought for Jean de Vienne's fleet about Cherbourg and all along the coast, but it was not to be found. This year the usual Castilian reinforcements had not appeared, and the French admiral had received orders from his cautious master not to fight without their aid. He had retired up the estuary of the Seine, and gone into harbour under the walls of Harfleur. Lancaster, finding that there was no enemy to fight, recast his plans. After some deliberation, he resolved to make a dash at St. Malo, a great haunt of corsairs and the key of the northern coast of Brittany. He could not hope to execute any lengthy land operations, because his knights had not brought their horses, naval battles only having been expected. But he thought that a landing in Brittany might cause a general rising of the country-side in favour of its exiled duke. The idea was not ill-founded, as the conduct of the Bretons in the next year was to prove, but in 1378 they were not ready. The garrison of St. Malo made a gallant defence; one attempt to take the place by escalade, and another to enter by mining were frustrated. A large French army under the dukes of Berry and Burgundy and the Constable du Guesclin presently appeared on the other side of the Rance. In accordance with his usual policy, the constable refused open battle, but cut off the English from communication with the Bretons of the inland, destroyed their foraging parties, and finally hemmed them in within their own lines.

CHAP. Lancaster, loth to depart without having accomplished any-
 I. thing, ordered a final attack on St. Malo by means of a mine, of which the Earl of Arundel had charge. But the garrison made a sortie into the trenches at midnight, surprised the earl, cut up his division, and wrecked the mine. Casting all the blame on Arundel, the duke ordered his army to re-embark, and got home to Southampton in the end of September.

This lamentable failure, which reduced lower than ever the duke's military reputation, and exposed him to much malevolent criticism,¹ had at least one good effect. It had caused Charles V. to draw away from the south a great army under his brother of Anjou, which had been sent out in July to renew the attack on the Bordelais. Only a small force was left in Guienne, besieging Mortagne, on the Lower Gironde, and this withdrew in haste when Lord Neville arrived at Bordeaux with the succours which had been promised for the aid of Charles of Navarre. Bayonne was also delivered from a pressing danger. Early in the year Enrique of Castile had beset the place with an army of 20,000 men, while his fleet, withdrawn from the Channel in the preceding winter, blockaded the mouth of the Adour. The garrison, under Sir Matthew Gurney, held out nobly, but was delivered not so much by its own valour as by a pestilence which broke out in the Castilian camp. Enrique at last abandoned the leaguer and marched home, and for the rest of the year Gascony was left unmolested. Thus it came to pass that Lord Neville, with the 3,000 men that he had brought from England in September, and the local levies of Guienne, was able to hold his own, and even to carry out the promised expedition for the aid of Navarre. Though the season had grown late, and All Souls' Day had arrived, Sir Thomas Trivet, one of the Black Prince's old captains, crossed the Pyrenees at the head of 600 lances, and aided King Charles to raise the siege of Pampeluna, then blockaded by Don Juan of Castile, the eldest son of King Enrique. Then at mid-winter he executed a raid deep into the enemy's territory. He crossed the Sierra de Moncayo in the snow, and ravaged the districts of Soria and Almazan, in the heart of Old Castile.

Though Bayonne had been saved, and Cherbourg and Brest

¹ See, for example, *Chron. Angl.*, pp. 205-6.

acquired, while serious French invasion of England had been rendered impossible by the existence of Lancaster's fleet, the nation was much disheartened by the results of the campaign of 1378. Jean de Vienne's galleys, indeed, had been shut up in Harfleur all the summer, yet small piratical squadrons had been troubling the high seas, and the council, intent on Lancaster's expedition, refused to distract any naval force against them. Thereupon John Philpot, an alderman of London and one of the war-treasurers appointed by the late parliament, armed several merchant ships and hired a force of 1,000 sailors and fighting men from his own resources. This improvised armament caught the main squadron of the pirates, commanded by a Scottish adventurer named Mercer,¹ beat it in a running fight, and took the Scot himself prisoner. With him fifteen French and Castilian ships were captured, and brought back to London in triumph. This exploit was received with well-deserved enthusiasm by every one save certain members of the council, who censured Philpot for waging war on a large scale without official authorisation, and received from the enterprising alderman the unanswerable reply that when the constituted rulers of the realm refuse help, every man has the natural right to endeavour to defend himself.

During the year 1378 the bishops attempted to bring their ecclesiastical censure to bear on John Wycliffe, and to enforce against him the papal bulls. How he escaped any practical inconvenience will be related hereafter. But violent as was the passion aroused by the attack on the daring theologian, his trial caused less stir than an untoward incident in London—the famous pollution of Westminster Abbey on August 11, 1378. The story deserves a brief notice. Two squires named John Shakel and Robert Haule had taken prisoner—long years before at the battle of Navarette—an Aragonese grandee, Alfonso, Duke of Gandia and Count of Denia. They allowed him to go home, leaving his eldest son in their hands as pledge for his ransom. But the years passed by, and the duke had not been able to raise the vast sum of 60,000 florins to buy back his heir.

¹ The son of another John Mercer "vir satis vafer et consilio providus," who was hired for many years by the King of France, and made the North Sea his special cruising ground. The father was at this moment a prisoner, but his son was continuing the work (*Chron. Angl.*, p. 198).

CHAP. I. At last he enlisted his suzerain, the King of Aragon, in his cause. Don Juan I. sent an ambassador to the English council, begging them to secure the release of the hostage. The squires refused to abate a florin of the long-delayed ransom; thereupon the council put them into the Tower. After some months both Shakel and Haule escaped, and took sanctuary in Westminster Abbey. At this the council grew angry, and ordered Sir Alan Buxhall, lieutenant of the Tower, to recover his prisoners as best he could. Buxhall was high-handed and reckless; he entered the abbey with a band of armed men, caught Shakel unawares and arrested him. Then, hearing that Haule was attending mass, he marched up into the choir to lay hands on him also. But the squire, a hot-headed fellow, drew out a short sword from under his gown, struck out at the sergeants, and, when they fell back, ran up the choir and took refuge at the altar. Disregarding time and place, Buxhall and his men pursued him; the monks and choirmen rushed in between, to ward off the irreverent intruders; a confused scuffle followed on the altar steps, and Haule was killed and a sacristan mortally wounded. Such a gross case of sacrilege had not been seen in England since the death of Becket, and the whole of the clergy of the realm rose up in fury. Archbishop Sudbury, though usually the most mild and placable of men, excommunicated not only Buxhall and his minions, but all their employers, aiders, and abettors, adding a special exemption for the king, his mother the Princess of Wales, and the Duke of Lancaster.¹ This extraordinary supplement suggested rather than denied that those royal personages were implicated in the matter, and the whole council was certainly involved in the sentence, for it had given Buxhall the order which led to his crime.

Meanwhile the abbey was shut up, as being polluted by blood, and when autumn had arrived the parliament was summoned to meet at Gloucester instead of at its usual mustering place. The houses sat from October 20 to November 16, and held many stormy debates. The council had to report that they had spent all the grants made them, and were in debt

¹ The king and princess had certainly nothing to do with the matter, while John of Gaunt was absent at the siege of St. Malo. It was therefore tactless to name them.

for many arrears due to Lancaster's unlucky armada and to the troops who had gone to Navarre. They faced their critics with the stain of the Westminster sacrilege upon them, excommunicate, at least by implication, as the abettors of Buxhall's bloody deed. The chancellor, Houghton, Bishop of St. David's, gave up the great seal before the session began, rather than meet the houses; he was replaced by Richard Lord Scrope, an old parliamentary hand, who was both a well-trusted public servant and also a *persona grata* to Lancaster, in whose retinue he had formerly served.

The ministers assumed a most apologetic pose: they laid open their accounts for public investigation. It was found that every penny could be accounted for by the war-treasurers, Philpot and Walworth. The Commons then turned to other grievances. We find petitions against the abuse of power by sheriffs, and a request that these officials might never hold their post for more than a year. Another demand was that the Statute of Labourers might be strengthened by new provisions for the pursuit of vagabonds and fugitive villeins. But the Westminster sacrilege was the main subject of debate. Archbishop Sudbury raised the question at once. The government took the line that, while deploring this particular incident, they were convinced that the right of sanctuary had become a mere abuse, and needed to be cut down or abolished altogether. They had submitted a string of questions on the point to certain doctors of divinity and canon law, as well as to the judges. These authorities came forward to depose that it was an abuse to allow debtors, or parties to civil suits, to use the right of sanctuary, which was intended only for those whose life was in danger. Among them was no less a person than John Wycliffe, whose presence was particularly offensive to the spiritual peers, as it showed that he was still under the protection of the government. His dictum was that sanctuary was an abuse at all times, and most especially when the fugitive was contumaciously evading arrest by the constituted authorities, like Shakel and Haule.¹

¹ No solid foundation can be found for Walsingham's (i., 363-64) venomous suggestion that the ministers were plotting at this moment to make a general assault on the Church, and to confiscate its lands. They were far too weak to dream of such a thing. The chronicler believes anything of the men who favoured Wycliffe.

CHAP.

I.

Apparently the ministers felt themselves too unpopular to dare to act upon the advice of Wycliffe and the jurisconsults. They came to a bargain with the archbishop, and nothing more was heard of the excommunication on one side, or the abolition of the right of sanctuary on the other. Shakel was liberated from custody, on condition of resigning all his claims upon his prisoner in return for lands to the value of 100 marks a year and 500 marks in cash. When asked to produce his hostage, the squire pointed to his own body servant. The young Count of Denia with a splendid sense of honour, had disguised himself, and followed his captor through all his troubles. The Gloucester parliament dispersed, having debated much but done little. The grants that were made were wholly insufficient to discharge the war expenses. All that winter the council were borrowing money for daily disbursements. By Easter they had piled up a debt of £20,000.

As if the English government had not already sufficient troubles in hand, it was confronted at this moment with all the problems arising from the Great Schism, which was destined to split up the western Church for the next forty years. On April 8, 1378, Urban VI. had been chosen pope at Rome; on September 20 the French cardinals had elected an anti-pope, Clement VII., at Fondi. The two rivals at once sent their emissaries all over Europe, to bid against each other for the support of kings and peoples. Letters from both sides were read before the parliament of Gloucester. Archbishop Sudbury showed from the first a strong predilection for the cause of Urban, and after ripe consideration the ministry followed his lead, and recognised the Roman pope. The step was inevitable; seventy years' experience of Avignonesse pontiffs had convinced every one that a pope chosen by French cardinals would be hostile to England: an Italian might be her friend. It was equally natural that Charles V. should take the opposite line: the Avignonesse popes had been the tools of the French monarchy, and Clement VII. would almost certainly be forced to follow their example. Of the other European states the Empire, Scandinavia and Flanders acknowledged Urban; Castile, Naples and Scotland recognised Clement. This division merely represented old political divergencies. National jealousies, and not an inquiry into the lawfulness of the papal election everywhere

settled the choice made by the various governments. But national jealousies were embittered by the new development ; any atrocity might be committed upon an enemy who was a schismatic, and cut off from the common rights of Christendom by the excommunication of the pope owned as apostolic by the victorious foe. CHAP. I.

Meanwhile the winter of 1378-9 was over, and the campaigning season drew near. But the treasury was empty, and it became necessary to summon a new parliament only five months after the old one had dispersed. There was one improvement in the situation : the whole of Brittany had risen in arms against Charles V., had called back its exiled duke, and was demanding English aid. By dwelling on the importance of this new development the chancellor Scrope hoped to obtain new supplies. After long discussion, the Commons decided to authorise a graduated poll tax, for which every adult person in the realm was assessed at a fixed sum of money great or small in proportion to his wealth.¹ It ranged down from ten marks on the Duke of Lancaster to fourpence on villeins and labourers. By this device it was believed that a sum of not less than £50,000 would be raised. The estimate was hopelessly optimistic ; no statistics existed on which the calculation could have been based, and there was a vague idea that the wealthy classes taxed at a high figure were very numerous. The clergy, sitting apart in the synods of the two provinces, were persuaded to contribute on the same system of a sliding scale. Anticipating matters somewhat, we may remark that the total sum raised by the poll tax was only £22,000, less than half what had been expected.

¹ The scale was :—

(1) The Duke of Lancaster, and the Duke of Brittany for his English estates, 10 marks each.

(2) The chief justices of the king's bench and common pleas, and the chief baron of the exchequer, £5 each.

(3) Earls, dowager-countesses, and the mayor of London, £4 each.

(4) Barons, bannerets and their widows, the prior of the Knights Hospitallers, the aldermen of London, the mayors of large towns, sergeants-at-law, advocates, notaries, and proctors of senior standing, £2 each.

(5) Knights-bachelors and their widows, commanders and knights of the Hospital, mayors of small towns, jurors and merchants of large towns, advocates and notaries of junior standing, from 20s. down to 3s. 4d.

(6) Other persons, 4d. each.

CHAP. The government had made the wildest of guesses at the taxable
I. wealth of the realm.

The poll tax proved as disappointing in the spending as it had been in the raising. The purpose for which it was set aside was the sending of succours to Brittany. A fleet was gathered at Southampton under Sir John Arundel, constable of England; but it assembled too late, and long lay storm-bound during the equinoctial gales. The troops disgraced themselves during their involuntary detention by committing outrages worthy of a foreign invader.¹ Arundel finally got to sea only on December 6; immediately after starting he was caught in a fierce northeaster: it drove him down the Channel and out into the Atlantic. Twenty-four of his ships were wrecked on the Irish coast, and he himself perished with many knights more. All the money spent on the expedition was wasted.

The news of Arundel's disaster compelled the English government to make one more appeal to parliament, which was summoned to assemble on January 14, 1380. The Lords and Commons met in high indignation, resolved that criminal carelessness on the part of the king's advisers had caused the late lamentable waste of lives and money, and evicted from office all the great ministers of state and the whole council. They then determined that "the king having now reached years of discretion" (the poor lad was little over thirteen!) it was no longer necessary that he should depute his powers to a council. He should be asked to take over the full discharge of his royal functions: he was given, however, a guardian and tutor in the person of the Earl of Warwick. The chancellor, treasurer, keeper of the privy seal, chamberlain, and steward of the household should be responsible for the future not to any council but to the king in person. Of the new ministers the chief was Archbishop Sudbury who took the office of chancellor, while Brantingham, Bishop of Exeter, was placed in charge of the treasury.² The archbishop was a pious, well-intentioned man, but deficient both in tact and in force of will. The monastic chroni-

¹ *Chron. Angl.* tells a ghastly tale of wholesale rape committed at a nunnery under the very eyes of Arundel himself (p. 253). What, the author asks, could be expected of a luxurious wretch who had fifty-two separate suits of clothes, all embroidered with gold and silver?

² He had been treasurer once before, in 1369-71.

clers, while bearing witness to his personal virtues, make it their chief accusation against him that he was a very half-hearted persecutor of Wycliffe and his followers. It is for this lukewarmness, not for any other sins, that they consider that he was visited with the awful end that befel him in 1381. After voting a tenth and a half-tenth to be levied on cities and boroughs, a fifteenth and a half from the shires, and an extension for a year of the existing subsidies, the houses dispersed, expressing their desire that the ministers would refrain from summoning a new parliament till a full twelve months should have elapsed.

The policy adopted by the new government shows distinct traces of the influence of John of Gaunt, for this year an attempt was made to conduct a diversion on the side of Spain. Now, as always, the duke maintained that it would be profitable for England to support his claim on the crown of Castile by armed intervention. He had made an agreement with Fernando of Portugal, who offered to assail the Spaniards if he was aided by an English contingent, and also promised to bestow the hand of his only daughter on the son of Edmund, Earl of Cambridge, the least notable of the sons of Edward III., and the uncle who gave least trouble to Richard II. In return Cambridge was to take over a strong force to Portugal. This, however, was the smaller of the enterprises undertaken by the English government in 1380. The greater was an expedition to Brittany, under the king's youngest uncle, Thomas, Earl of Buckingham, who had yet to prove his capacity to handle a large army. He chose a most extraordinary route; he began by landing at Calais, but, instead of cutting across Normandy, made a complete circuit round Paris, past St. Quentin, Laon, Reims, Troyes, Sens, Orleans, and Le Mans. Charles of France stuck to his old military policy, and sent strict orders to his generals not to fight a pitched battle, but to follow the English at a cautious distance, and garrison all the fortresses near their path. Accordingly his uncles Burgundy and Anjou merely escorted the English to the borders of Brittany. Buckingham's objectless march took nearly three months; he left Calais on July 20, and did not reach Rennes till October, when the campaigning season was practically over.

Meanwhile King Charles V. had died on September 16 and a few weeks before him his great Constable, Bertrand du

CHAP.
I.

CHAP. I. Guesclin, had also expired. Thus England lost her two most capable adversaries. Instead of the astute Charles V., the crown of France was now worn by a young boy, even more obsessed by ambitious and incapable uncles than was Richard II. himself. But though the ultimate effect of the death of the French king was beneficial to England, its immediate result was pernicious. The Duke of Brittany was the personal enemy of Charles V., but had no prejudice against his successor. He opened negotiations for peace with the French ministers only a few days after Buckingham reached Rennes. The court of Paris agreed to recognise him as the legitimate ruler of Brittany on January 15, 1381, and when sure of this concession John of Montfort became more anxious to get rid of his inconvenient auxiliaries. Buckingham was forced, in deep disgust, to take off his army as soon as the spring came round. While Buckingham had been cutting his way across France there had been lively campaigning on the high seas. It had been in the main favourable to England. The Franco-Castilian fleet which held the Channel had gone off westwards for a raid on Ireland, when it was attacked off Kinsale by a squadron of Bristol and Devonshire ships, and suffered a severe defeat. Jean de Vers, admiral of France, and the seneschals of Santander and Biscay were captured with some score of their ships on June 10, 1380. Yet this victory did not prevent several small descents by Norman pirates on the south coast. The Scots, too, were busy this summer. Though the government of Robert II. professed the most pacific views, the border barons of the West Marches made a fierce raid into Cumberland and Westmorland, sacking and burning Penrith, and carrying off, so it was said, no less than 40,000 head of cattle.

The new chancellor had promised the parliament of January, 1380, that he would not call another session till a full year had passed. But in October Sudbury had to confess that his pledge could not be kept: financial affairs were again so hopeless that he was forced to appeal once more to the nation. The second parliament of the year met at Northampton on November 5, in a surly mood. Yet though the houses grumbled loud and long, they did not suggest that peace would be cheap at any price, but merely asked the ministers of the crown to name the smallest grant with which the war could be sustained. After

some hesitation the chancellor-archbishop fixed £160,000 as the contribution that would suffice for the king's needs. Three ways of raising it were suggested: there was the ordinary method of granting the crown "tenths" and "fifteenths"; secondly, it might be possible to collect the money by a "poundage" on all mercantile transactions within the kingdom, or, thirdly, it might be raised by a poll tax of three groats a head on the whole adult population of England. The Commons took these three proposals into consideration, and finally chose the poll tax as the least objectionable of the three. It seems certain that the members were influenced by their own middle-class interests in doing so. They had a strong, and not altogether groundless, idea that the lower strata of society were not contributing their fair share to the expenses of the realm, or, as they phrased it themselves, that "all the wealth of England has gone into the hands of the labourers and workmen". The "poundage" would have fallen mainly on the merchants: the tenths and fifteenths on landholders in the shires and house-holders in the boroughs. The poll tax would hit every one. Accordingly the Commons voted that "in spite of their great poverty and distress," they would grant £100,000, to be raised by a poll tax, if the clergy, "who occupy the third part of the lands of this realm," would undertake to raise the rest of the money demanded by the chancellor.

CHAP.
I.

The clergy, anxious in all probability to give no occasion to their enemies for suggesting some measure of disendowment as the easiest way of filling the treasury, rose to the occasion with unexpected liberality. They promised that the convocations of the two provinces would vote 50,000 marks. On this assurance the Commons proceeded to draft their scheme for the raising of the poll tax. It was provided "that every lay person in the realm above the age of fifteen years, save beggars, should pay three groats". But the distribution of the sum of one shilling per head was to be so arranged that in each township the wealthier should aid the poorer, on the scale that "the richest person should not pay more than sixty groats (£1) for himself and his wife, nor the most indigent less than one groat for himself and his wife". There was, as we shall see, grave injustice involved in this method of distribution, but it is probable that the Commons did not foresee the way in which the scheme

CHAP. I. would work out, by pressing most hardly on the poorest places. In addition to granting the poll tax, they renewed the subsidy on wool, and suggested that all alien priories might be sequestered, a measure which Archbishop Sudbury was not bold enough to undertake.

Shortly after parliament had been dissolved, the treasurer, Bishop Brantingham, resigned ; he saved his neck thereby, for the odium of raising the poll tax fell on his successor, Sir Robert Hales, prior of the Knights Hospitallers. It was Hales who settled the details of the levy, under the authority of letters patent dated December 7, 1380. Collectors of the poll tax were appointed for each shire, who dealt through sub-collectors with the constables of townships and the mayors or bailiffs of boroughs. These officials had to make a return showing the name of every adult person in the place of which they had charge, and to see that an average of exactly one shilling a head was paid over to the collectors. It was not long before the inconveniences of this system came to light ; the unit of collection was so small that the kindly-meant provision that "the strong should help the weak" failed to work in precisely those regions where help was most needed. In boroughs, or large villages, or places where some rich landowner chanced to reside, the wealthy households paid four, five, or more shillings a head, and so the labourer could be let off with sixpence or eightpence for himself and his wife—as parliament had provided. But in poor villages, where no substantial householder existed to take up more than his share, every cottager had to pay the full shilling, for want of a helper.

Universal indignation in the poorer places was roused by this discovery, but a remedy for the inequity of the tax seems to have occurred simultaneously to the villagers over the greater part of England. It was the simple one of making false returns as to the size of their families. The constables must either have been willing parties to the fraud, or have been coaxed or coerced by their neighbours. The collectors, on the other hand, had such large districts—whole counties—to supervise, that they can have had no sufficient knowledge of any individual village to enable them to detect the trick. But when the shire-totals were made up, it became evident that the figures sent in were preposterous. There existed for purposes of comparison the rolls of the earlier

poll tax of 1377. To the latter all persons of over fourteen years had contributed; in 1381 every one over fifteen was assessed, so that a fall of some tens of thousands in the total enumerated was to be expected. Instead of any such proportional decrease in the taxable persons appearing the collectors of the shires returned accounts for only 896,451 adults, as against 1,355,201 who had been shown in 1377.¹ According as the evasion was more or less shameless in the particular shire, the population, if the new rolls were to be trusted, had fallen away by 20, 30, 40, or even 50 per cent. The wildest figures were returned from some of the remoter counties—the North Riding of Yorkshire gave 15,690 souls instead of 33,185; the West Riding, 23,029 instead of 48,149; Cornwall, 12,056 instead of 34,274; Devon, 20,656 instead of 46,635. In the south and east the shrinkage though notable, was not so bad; as typical examples Oxfordshire had gone down from 24,982 to 20,588; Kent from 56,557 to 43,838; Suffolk from 58,610 to 44,035; Wiltshire from 42,599 to 30,627. But even the least of these decreases was incredible, when it was remembered that England, though the times were hard, had been visited neither by plague, famine, nor serious foreign invasion.

A search through the details of the township returns, of which many hundreds, even thousands, are preserved in the Record Office, reveals the chief method of evasion which the villagers had practised. They probably suppressed certain poor households altogether, but the commoner trick had been to make no return of unmarried female dependants, widowed mothers and aunts, sisters, or young daughters. Some villages are shameless enough to deny the existence of any widows or spinsters in their population, and send in a list showing nothing but a symmetrical set of married pairs. More commonly, at the end of a long enumeration of men and wives, we have a moderate number of bachelors and widowers and a very much smaller number of unattached females.² The general result is to show an average of five males to four females—occasionally even of four males to three females—a proportion absolutely impossible in

¹ Excluding in both cases Cheshire and Durham.

² I have found scores of such cases. For typical examples see the Suffolk tax rolls printed in Mr. E. Powell's *Rising of 1381 in East Anglia*, or the Essex rolls in my own *Great Revolt of 1381*.

CHAP. an old agricultural community like fourteenth century England.¹
I. Such a preponderance of the male sex is only to be found, in reality, in newly settled emigrant societies, or in regions where systematic female infanticide prevails. There are villages where an honest constable has returned a due balance of the sexes, and a list of widows and spinsters corresponding to that of bachelors; but these are few and far between. The bulk of the returns bears witness to a systematic attempt to defraud the collectors by suppressing dependants, and returning little more than heads of households and their wives.

The scheme failed because it was overdone; the figures returned were simply incredible. The king's ministers saw that they were being cheated, and resolved to institute inquisitorial researches into the falsified rolls, with the object of discovering and taxing all the suppressed persons, and of detecting all those collectors and others who had concocted the garbled figures. On February 22, 1381, the council issued a writ to the barons of the exchequer in the king's name, stating that efforts must be made to collect the whole tax, as the sum already raised was lamentably insufficient. On March 16 they issued an additional mandate, declaring that the collectors, sub-collectors, constables, and others concerned in levying the tax, have been careless and corrupt, and creating a fresh body of commissioners who were to travel from hundred to hundred, comparing the actual number of residents in each village with the number returned on the collectors' schedules. They were to be given power to raise the shilling on every person hitherto untaxed, and to imprison those who offered resistance. For reasons which we cannot discover, the commissioners are named for fifteen shires only, for those of the south-east, and in addition Somerset, Devon, Cornwall, Gloucestershire, and the West Riding of Yorkshire. Four of the last five named regions were very bad offenders in the way of falsification.

The commissioners were appointed in the end of March. Some difficulty was found in completing the list, for many persons designated excused themselves, judging that the em-

¹ Thingoe hundred, in Suffolk, returns a total of 487 males to 383 females, and is not exceptional, though higher than the average in its falsification. It is rare to find a village in Suffolk or Essex without a large excess of males.

ployment would be invidious if not dangerous. In many regions there must have been hardly a family which had not sent in a false return. All the concealed persons liable to the tax had to be hunted up, and the shilling extracted from them: and such persons would generally be the poorest of the poor, old widows, and the fifteen- or sixteen-year-old daughters (or less frequently sons) of labourers and small handicraftsmen. Nevertheless, the commissioners for the scheduled shires got to work in April and May. Their activity at once brought to light frauds on the most enormous scale. In Norfolk 8,000 persons were found to have evaded the original collection, in Suffolk no less than 13,000. The missing shillings began to appear, *non sine diris maledictionibus*. But the revision was far from being completed when the furious country-side rose up in arms against the commissioners, the ministry, the whole order of society under which they were being subjected to this inquisition.

CHAP.
I.

CHAPTER II.

THE GREAT REBELLION OF 1381.

CHAP. II. THE poll tax of 1381 seems to have stood to the great rebellion of that year much as the greased cartridges of 1857 stood to the Indian Mutiny. It brought about the explosion: it was not its cause. Things had been working up for trouble during many years: only a good cry, a grievance that united all malcontents, was needed to bring matters to a head. This was precisely what the poll tax provided.

Medieval England was unreasonably jealous of taxation. The theory that "the king should live of his own" was universally prevalent; but, as any one who had to do with the national finance soon discovered, the royal revenue was not adequate to maintain the government even in time of peace. With a costly and unsuccessful war on hand, it was absolutely impossible to provide for the expenses of the realm without extraordinary taxation. If the council had been able to show satisfactory results for the money spent, there would not have been much murmuring at the increase of imposts. But a ministry which had perpetually to be reporting new losses in Aquitaine, which could not even keep the coast of England clear of pirates, and failed to maintain good order within the kingdom, was bound to find every one of its financial expedients criticised with acrimony. Yet, if financial and military problems alone had been troubling the realm in 1381, there would have been no outbreak of rebellion, despite of all the irritation caused by the circuits of the commissioners of the poll tax. It was the fact that this new grievance came at a moment when ancient social problems had reached boiling-point that led to the explosion. Of these social grievances the old strife between the landholder and the peasant, which dated back to the Black

Death and the Statute of Labourers of 1351, was the most important, since it affected the greatest number of individuals. But not less bitter was the grudge in the urban communities between the rulers and the ruled, the privileged and the unprivileged, which made the towns as violent in their outburst as the agricultural districts.

The Black Death, by sweeping away in a few months one-third of the population of England, had permanently raised the price of labour, while the prices of agricultural produce on the other hand had remained comparatively stationary. The system by which the landowner farmed his own acres by means of the forced labour of his villeins had already begun to disappear before 1348: the commutation of services for rent had begun. After the pestilence unfree labourers were so much decreased in numbers that crofts were lying empty on every side, because whole families had perished. The lord could not find new tenants who would take up the vacant holdings on the old conditions of servile labour. There was therefore a permanent deficit in the total amount of labour that could be obtained from the peasants of the manor. In face of this problem many landlords gave up farming their demesne, and let it out on the so-called "stock and land lease" system. Others threw it into sheep farms, an unpopular device. But many strove to keep on the old services as far as possible, supplementing them by the costly expedient of hiring free labour.

If class legislation on behalf of the landlords had not intervened, the period following the Black Death would have been a sort of golden age for the free peasant, who could demand what he pleased for the hire of his hands. But the governing classes, the moment that they were confronted with this new and inconvenient development, had caused the enactment of the celebrated Statute of Labourers, whose provisions have been dealt with in an earlier volume.¹ Suffice it to say here that employers were prohibited under heavy penalties from offering, or employees from asking, more than the old rates of pay which had prevailed before the pestilence. It was not likely that such legislation would be accepted without resistance by a sturdy and often turbulent peasantry. For a whole generation the landholding

¹ See vol. iii., 373-75.

CHAP.
II.

class had been endeavouring to enforce it in a spasmodic way, while the labouring class were setting their wits to find means of evading it. Despite the perpetual re-enactments and revisions of the statute, in which almost every parliament between 1351 and 1381 indulged, the landowners had failed to achieve a complete victory. Indeed the labourers in many parts of England had won a very considerable amount of success. If they were harried and held down to the letter of the statute in one district, they would move on to another, where landlords were less harsh. Though it was legally possible for any would-be employer to seize on vagrants and bind them down to serve him, yet practically such captives were difficult to take and almost impossible to retain. There were always plenty of employers who would gladly give much higher wages than the statute allowed, and it was they, of course, who obtained the services of the labourer.¹

In many regions, then, the day-worker enjoyed a considerable if a precarious prosperity. He might suffer spasmodic persecution if some landholder called in the justices for enforcing the Statute of Labourers. In such a case it might be necessary to make a moonlight flitting to some shire fifty miles away. But we should gather from the petulant language of acts of parliament that the stringent enforcement of the statute was the exception, not the rule. Their denunciation of the tricks and evasions of the labourer proves that a large proportion of the landowning class winked at these contraventions of the law. They reveal to us the existence of a cunning, semi-migratory race of free labourers, who contrive to get through life with a minimum of friction with the law and a maximum of illegal profits. Such folks must have borne a vigorous hatred to the landholder who invoked the statute, the justice who enforced it, the parliament which was always tinkering away at its provisions. When we remember that branding and outlawry were among the supplementary terrors added by the care of parliament in 1360 to the original statute of 1351, we cannot wonder at the labourers' rage.

¹ If Thorold Rogers is right in his interpretation, we find that in many manors the bailiff would make a double entry of wages, marking first the legal sum due, for production to an inquisitive justice in search of contraveners of the statute, and afterwards putting down the real amount—always much larger—which he had disbursed. *Work and Wages*, pp. 232-3.

So far we have been considering the condition of the landless worker. But even the ordinary villein, who owned a cottage and some few slips in the great village field, was beginning to sit more loosely to the land. Some threw up their holdings and absconded, to seek free service in some distant county or borough. But flight was less frequent than attempts to combine against the lord and worry him into coming to terms. In the manors where owner and villeins could not agree we find that the modern phenomena of strikes and agricultural unions were common. Again and again the villeins of a manor are seen confederating themselves to resist their lord, and refuse to execute customs and services of undisputed antiquity. When they did not practise open rebellion, which would be put down by force when the lord had made his appeal for aid to the council and the justices, they tried the easier and less perilous device of putting in inefficient and grudging work. The landowner might be worried, if he could not be coerced, into commuting the odious services for a money payment or a fixed rent. It seems clear that weak men often yielded to this pressure. Strong men, on the other hand, maintained for year after year a kind of perpetual campaign against their tenants, using the fines of the manor court as their primary weapon, and falling back upon the justices when their own local machinery proved insufficient to produce obedience.

It must be remembered that it was not merely the actual days of work upon the lord's demesne against which the villein was protesting at this time. All the smaller incidents of his tenure were odious to him, the petty payments of hens or eggs at certain festivals, the heriots due at death, the marriage fees exacted when he married off his daughters, the small but vexatious dues on the sale of a cow or a horse, the prohibition to grind corn elsewhere than at the manorial mill. When in the short day of their triumph in June, 1381, the peasants could dictate charters to their lords, all these were set down for abolition. Not unfrequently the right to hunt and fish on the waste of the manor was also demanded; it is clear that the villein chafed against the prohibition to snare the rabbit that nibbled on the edge of his field, and the pike that haunted the lord's preserved waters. The rabbit hung on a pole was used more than once during the insurrection as a sort of emblem or

CHAP.
II.

standard by rioters. All over rural England then there existed in 1381 a thousand local centres of friction, around which discontent was endemic and rioting not unfrequent. To produce a general catastrophe there was only necessary some wind from outside, which should combine the isolated smouldering fires in a single conflagration, and send them roaring across the realm.

Carefully to be distinguished from the rural revolt, yet blending with it in the moment of crisis, was the discontent of the towns. Where we find an urban community implicated in the troubles of 1381 we discover on investigation that its grievances are of one of two separate kinds. We may set in one category places like St. Albans, Bury St. Edmunds, Dunstable, and, to a certain extent, Lynn, where the rising was in favour of municipal liberty, its object being to wring a charter out of the local lord, or to add new clauses to a partial grant of privileges already existing. It may be noted that these towns, without exception, were in the hands of the Church: abbots and bishops were notoriously slow in conceding to their tenants rights which the crown and the lay proprietors had been granting freely for the last two centuries. From the grievances of such communities we must carefully distinguish another kind of urban discontent, which was far commoner in 1381. This was the grudge of the *inferiores* against the *potentiores*, of the unprivileged against the privileged, in towns which already possessed a charter and a constitution. The history of the majority of English boroughs in the fourteenth century is mainly concerned with the struggle of the poorer inhabitants against the small number of wealthy families which had obtained control of the local administration. In many places there was now a close oligarchy, which had usurped the whole function of civic government, which levied tallages and contracted debts in the name of the community, which oppressed malcontents with indictments and fines when they dared to grumble or resist, which had completely forgotten that it had duties and only remembered that it had rights. Wherever the municipal government had been corrupt and oppressive, there was a solid nucleus of individuals who bore it a grudge, and were ready to attack it when the days of anarchy came round. Hence came the numberless cases in which the houses of rich burgesses were sacked, sometimes

with the loss of the owner's life, in June, 1381. In some towns the local revolt flamed up the moment that the first troubles in Kent and Sussex were reported. Without a day's delay, or any waiting for external encouragement, the oppressed majority fell upon the oligarchies to make an end of them. Such was the case at Winchester, Beverley, Scarborough; at Canterbury and Norwich the poorer townsmen were more cautious, and waited for the arrival of the peasant army before they took their revenge.

In London and one or two other great towns it was no mere quarrel between an official ring of oligarchs and a discontented mass of *inferiores* which was at the root of the troubles of 1381. There was also a fierce struggle on foot between the employers and the employed. The days were past when the masters in any trade were small men, each keeping only one or two apprentices, who hoped some day to become masters themselves in turn. There had arisen large manufacturers and *entrepreneurs* in every craft, who each maintained several hired workers, and deliberately made it hard for their apprentices to start in business for themselves when the years of servitude were over. Thus a numerous and discontented class of journeymen, as we should call them—*valets* or yeomen or serving-men in fourteenth century phraseology—had come into existence. They were destitute of legal rights, but protected themselves by combining in leagues and conventicles, just as the manorial peasantry were doing. Trades unions of journeymen engaged in strife with their employers are found very early in the fourteenth century. They had learnt all the tricks of combination: we even read of black marks placed by the union against certain employers, who could therefore find no man to serve them. The Statute of Labourers was aimed at the journeyman in the town no less than at the agricultural worker, and was as irritating and as ineffective with the one class as with the other. Despite of it the rate of wages for artisans of all sorts had risen; in consequence of it the rise had been won at the cost of desperate friction. The interminable struggle was still in progress; in every craft there were unpopular masters and discontented or unemployed men. Whether their individual grievances were real or imaginary, the latter were ready for mischief when the chance of riot came.

CHAP.
II.

But the journeymen were not the most miserable or the most malcontent class in London. Below them was a mass of unskilled and casually employed labourers, such as always accumulates in large towns. This unhappy stratum of society, constantly recruited by fugitive villeins from the rural districts, was peculiarly galled by the rigidity of the medieval social system, which threw such difficulties in the way of the transference of the individual from one trade or occupation to another. It was hard for the stranger and the immigrant to force his way into any regular employment; he could only hang on to the skirts of trade, and herd with the loafers and mendicants. This "submerged tenth" and the professional criminals of a great city formed a fine nucleus for a mischievous mob when the occasion arose. It is notable that the urban rioters, not only in London but in other towns also, showed a fierce hatred for foreigners in 1381. Murderous assaults on Flemings and Lombards are a marked feature of the insurrection. Alien merchants were currently supposed to be sucking the marrow out of the country; it was the fixed belief of every class of citizen that their one end in life was to drain away gold and silver from England, and to pay only in useless luxuries. It was not only the mob which held such views: parliament was continually reiterating them, and striving to invent some new regulation which should force the alien to buy English goods, and pay in hard cash only, not in his own produce—a consummation unhappily rendered impossible by the elementary facts of political economy. The alien manufacturer was even more hated than the alien merchant; he was almost invariably a Fleming who had established himself in England, under the protection of the government, to practise the woollen industry. Oblivious of the benefits of his presence, the English workmen could only see in him a rival who was ruining native weavers. He was currently reputed to be a "sweater," an employer of cheap labour who undersold honest English competitors by employing destitute aliens, women, and children. He lived under the protecting hand of the central government; when that hand became for a moment powerless, he was fair game for the bludgeon of every ignorant ruffian.

With so many explosive elements lying ready for the fatal spark, it is no wonder that England was riven and blasted by

its application. The opportunity for the malcontents arrived when the war cry against the poll tax was once raised, and the machinery of law and order failed. Then was the time for the villein to attack the landowner, for the unchartered townsman to wring privileges from his abbot, for the local demagogue to fall upon the local oligarch, for the journeyman to settle old accounts with his master, for the ruined tradesman to slay his Flemish supplanter.

It is now possible to proceed to the details of the great revolt, whose causes have been set forth. The actual outbreak of violence began in Essex in the last days of May. Thomas Bampton, one of the new commissioners, had ridden down to Brentwood to revise the taxation-returns of the hundred of Barstaple. He opened the inquiry with the examination of the three villages of Fobbing, Corringham, and Stanford.¹ When summoned before him the villagers bluntly stated that they did not intend to pay a penny more than they had already contributed.² Bampton bade his sergeants arrest the spokesman. This gave the signal for violence, which had evidently been premeditated; the peasants, about 100 strong, fell upon the commissioner and his men and stoned them out of the town. Bampton, bruised and frightened, reported his misadventure to the council. Thereupon Robert Belknap, chief justice of the Common Pleas, was sent down to Brentwood, on a commission of Trailbaston, to seek out and chastise the rioters. With inexcusable folly, he was allowed to go forth without an armed escort. Meanwhile, as we learn from the judicial records of the rebellion, messengers, some of them local men, others strangers from London, had been riding up and down South Essex on June 1, rousing malcontents and bidding them be ready to receive the judge when he should appear. On arriving at Brentwood Belknap and his clerks were set upon by an armed multitude. He himself was seized and forced to swear upon the Bible that he would never hold such another session. The mob then let him go, but they beat to death three unhappy clerks,

¹ These details are from the Chronicle in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, xiii. (1898), p. 509, printed by Mr. G. M. Trevelyan.

² "Ilz ne voderont nulle denier paier, pur cause que ils avoient un acquittance de luy mesmes pur celle subsidie. Sur lequel ledit Thomas les manassa fortement," etc. (*ibid.*, p. 510).

CHAP. II. and beheaded three of the local jurors who had been called up to "present" the original rioters of Fobbing and Corringham.

We might have expected that the council, seeing itself thus defied, would have hastened to send an armed force into Essex. But already it was not Essex alone that was up in insurrection; Kent had joined in, and the unfortunate ministers were distracted between two dangers. On June 2, the day after the Brentwood murders, a small band appeared in arms south of the Thames, and scared the abbot of Lesness. Two mornings later a considerable mob, headed by one Robert Cave, a baker, entered Dartford "traitorously moving the men of the said town to insurrection, and making divers assemblies and congregations against the king's peace". On the 6th the assembly had swelled to a mob of several thousands, which beset the castle of Rochester and frightened the constable, Sir John Newton, into capitulating. After delivering a certain prisoner from the castle¹ they marched up the Medway to Maidstone, where they slew a burgess named John Southwell, and sacked his house and several others. "There at Maidstone," says the most detailed and trustworthy of our chroniclers, "they chose as their chief Wat Teghler of that place, to maintain them and act as their councillor." Who was this enigmatical personage? The legends which make him an artisan of Dartford, whose daughter had been insulted by one of the collectors of the poll tax, may safely be ignored. For though the names of seven or eight of the original Dartford rioters are preserved in the indictment rolls, there is no Walter and no Tyler among them. It seems equally doubtful if he was domiciled at Maidstone; the Rolls of Parliament simply call him "Wauter Tyler del countée de Kent". But a presentment by two Kentish juries styles him "Walterum Teghler de Essex," and a document from Maidstone names him as Walter Tyler of Colchester. If a Colchester

¹ In the indictment of Robert Cave it is stated that the captive objected to being released: "Robertum Belling, prisonem in eodem castro detentum, contra voluntatem ipsius prisonis cepit [idem Robertus] et cum eo abduxit". It is clear that Belling must be a person mentioned in the Chronicle in *Engl. Hist. Rev.* (p. 509), where it is stated that Sir Simon Burley had caused much indignation at Dartford by arresting there, on June 3, an escaped villein of his own, whom he seized and placed in ward at Rochester. Evidently the purpose of Cave's assault on the castle was the release of a prisoner whose arrest had caused much stir.

man he must have known John Ball, who had long been a resident in that town. But whether an Essex man or no, Walter would seem to have been an adventurer of doubtful antecedents. We know that one Kentishman declared that he was a well-known rogue and robber.¹ Froissart, whose authority in purely English matters is small, says that he was a discharged soldier from the French war, where he had served in the retinue of Richard Lyons (the swindling financier against whom the "good parliament" raged), and adds that Tyler murdered Lyons during the London insurrection in revenge for a thrashing received many years back. If it be true that he had served in the wars, we can better understand his evident capacity for command, and the strict discipline in which he kept his tumultuary army. Whatever were his antecedents, we know that he was a quick-witted, ambitious, self-reliant fellow, with an insolent tongue and that gift of magniloquence which a mob-leader needs. That he was anything more there is no reason to believe; it does not seem either that he was the original organiser of the insurrection, or that he had elaborated any definite scheme for the reformation of the governance of England. It is most probable that his plans developed with the unexpected growth of his ascendancy, when, for three wild days, he seemed to have the king, London, even the whole realm at his mercy.

On June 8 and 9 the area of the rising was extending all over Kent, and a good deal of sporadic mischief was done in the county. The anger of the insurgents was mainly directed against three classes—royal officials, lawyers, and unpopular landlords. There was much sacking and burning of the houses of such persons, but little actual murder. On the 10th Tyler seized Canterbury: his followers pillaged the archbishop's palace, and paid a flying visit to the cathedral, to inform the terrified chapter that they would soon have a new primate, for the present one was a traitor and had not long to live. The local mob joined the invaders, and delated to them three citizens as "traitors," whereupon Tyler had them beheaded. There was much house-breaking, blackmail, and wanton pillage, which continued for several days after the main body of the insurgents and their

¹ "Un valet de Kent pria pur voir le dit Walter, et quand il le vist il dist apertement que fust le plus grand larron et robbare de Kent" (*Chronicle in Engl. Hist. Rev.*, p. 519).

CHAP. chief had taken their departure. For on the very morning after
 II. the capture of Canterbury Tyler led off his horde, swollen by all the levies of eastern Kent, on the road to London. It was only by seizing the capital and the person of the king that he could hope to succeed: no amount of local riot would profit him, and if he dallied long the council would gain time to raise an army.

It was while passing through Maidstone on the 11th that Tyler was joined by the person who was destined to be the second notable figure in the rising, John Ball, "the mad priest of Kent". The rebels had released him from the archbishop's prison, where he had been lying since April. Ball had long been a well-known figure in southern England: it was not the first time that he had seen the inside of a jail during his wanderings as a prophet and preacher. Archbishop Sudbury had arrested him on this occasion for "beguiling the ears of the laity by invectives, and putting about scandals concerning our own person, as also those of other prelates, and (what is far worse) using, concerning our Holy Father the Pope himself, dreadful language, such as shocks the ears of Christians".¹ When liberated, after two months' silence, Ball had a fund of suppressed eloquence to vent. He thought that he now saw the actual beginnings of that reign of Christian democracy of which he had long dreamed. All social inequalities were to be redressed, spiritual wickedness in high places, evil living, covetousness and pride were to be chastened, and there would no longer be rich or poor. It is presumably to the first days of Ball's release that belong the strange rhyming letters which he sent abroad.

"John Ball greeteth you well all, and doth you to understand that he hath rongen your bell. Now right and might, will and skill. Now God haste you in every dele. Time it is that our Lady help you with her Son, and her Son with his Father, to make in the name of the Trinity a good end to what has been begun. Amen, Amen, for charity Amen."²

A second effusion is more interesting, as it seems to have a more practical and political bearing:—

"John Schepe, sometime St. Mary's priest of York, and now of Colchester, greeteth well John Nameless, and John the

¹ So runs the archbishop's statement in *Concilia*, iii., 153.

² Preserved in Knighton, ii., 139-40.

Miller, and John the Carter, and biddeth them that they beware of guile in borough, and stand together in God's name, and biddeth Piers Plowman go to his work; and chastise well Hobbe the Robber, and take with you John Trueman and his fellows, and no mo: and look that ye shape you to one head and no mo."¹

CHAP.
II.

The point of this epistle is evidently to urge the multitude to preserve unity, good faith and discipline, to bid them beware of being turned from their larger designs by the guile of townsfolk, who would draw them into taking sides in local quarrels, and above all to warn them against false brethren, who would turn aside to pillage and self-seeking. "Hobbe the Robber" is presumably Sir Robert Hales, the treasurer, who was looked upon as the ultimate recipient of the poll tax.

On the evening of the 12th the main body of the Kentish rebels encamped on Blackheath, but those of them who were not tired out by their long march pushed on to Southwark and Lambeth. In the nearer suburb they burnt the prisons of the Marshalsea and the King's Bench, in the farther they sacked the archbishop's palace. The flames of the burning prisons flared up all night in the sight of the king and his councillors in the Tower, and of the mayor Walworth, and his aldermen, who had pulled up the drawbridge of London bridge and watched from the embattled gate beyond it the first-fruits of approaching arson. It was not only from the Kentish side that the city was now threatened. The progress of the rebellion in Essex had been no less rapid; between the 2nd and the 12th the wave of rebellion had swept across the whole county; in every parish the court-rolls had been burnt, and often the manor-house with them. Colchester had fallen into the hands of the insurgents; they celebrated its capture by slaying several Flemings, and on the 11th they had gathered into a mass and rolled onward toward London. On the 12th many thousands of them lay encamped in the fields by Mile End. Their leaders were obscure persons; Thomas Farringdon, a London citizen with a grievance, is the only one of whom we know much—the rest, Henry Baker of Manningtree, Adam Michel, John Starling, are but names to us.

On the evening of the 12th, therefore, the royal council in

¹ Preserved in *Chron. Angl.*, p. 322.

CHAP.
II.

the Tower and the city fathers at the Guildhall had to face the situation as best they could. It is astonishing that in the twelve days that elapsed since the outbreak at Brentwood the ministers had made no serious attempt to collect an armed force. There were, as later events showed, thousands of citizens ready to take arms for the protection of their property from anarchy. But a military head was wanting at the council board; John of Gaunt was at Edinburgh negotiating with the Scots; Thomas of Buckingham was absent on the Welsh border; Edmund of Cambridge had just sailed for Portugal. The main responsibility lay on the chancellor-archbishop, who was so far from thinking of self-defence that on this very night he laid down the seals, and begged leave to retire from his ministerial position. Contemporary chroniclers note with wonder the strange panic or apathy which seemed to have struck the governing classes during the first fortnight of that memorable June. Among the magnates in the Tower were at least two old soldiers, the Earls of Salisbury and Warwick, but they seem to have been no more useful than their colleagues at the moment of crisis. In the city there was the same helpless indecision; the mayor Walworth and the majority of the aldermen viewed the situation with dismay. They knew that the artisans and unskilled labourers of London regarded them as selfish and oppressive rulers, and would gladly sweep them to destruction. But they did nothing to defend themselves. They merely sent three aldermen to the insurgent camp to warn the rebels to approach no nearer, and to respect the king's command bidding them to disperse. Two of these emissaries faithfully discharged their errand, but the third, John Horn, was a secret traitor, one of the discontented men who, for reasons of their own, wished to destroy their brother-oligarchs. He sought a private interview with Tyler, bade him expect help from within, and encouraged him to attack the city at once. He took back with him into the city three Kentish leaders who were to aid in organising a rising next day.

Accordingly on the morning of the 12th the rebels were in high spirits. It was early on this day that John Ball preached them his famous sermon on Blackheath, using as his text the jingling couplet:—

When Adam dalf and Eve span,
Who was then a gentilman ?

CHAP.
II.

In the beginning all men were equal ; servitude of man to man was introduced by the unjust dealings of the wicked, and was contrary to God's will. The people of England had at last a chance of restoring the primitive freedom that was their right. They must act like the good husbandman of the parable, who gathered the wheat into his barn, but burned the tares, the said tares being evil lords, unjust judges, and pettifogging lawyers. The multitude, as we are told, cried with a loud voice that they would make him both chancellor and archbishop when the traitor Sudbury's head was off.

The sermon can hardly have been done when the rebels were informed that the king was coming out to meet them. They had sent him a message protesting that they were loyal subjects, only anxious to lay before him their grievances. Despite the protests of Sudbury and other councillors, Richard determined to give them a hearing ; the risk was terrible, yet there was a bare chance that the insurgents might be pacified. But when the royal barge drew near the Greenwich shore, the young king saw the sloping banks covered by a vast, disorderly crowd, some of whom were giving loyal cheers, while others were clamouring for the heads of the chancellor and the Duke of Lancaster. They bade him land, but his councillors refused to surrender him into the hands of the disorderly horde. Sudbury bade the bargemen push off, and among shouts of " Treason ! " from ten thousand voices the king returned to the Tower.

The interview having come to naught, Tyler bade his bands march against London bridge. It was betrayed to them without fighting. Walter Sibley, alderman of Billingsgate ward, who was in command at this point, was one of the city traitors ; he lowered the drawbridge, over which the rebels streamed into London. At first no damage was done to the property of ordinary citizens. The chiefs had the mob well in hand, and kept adjuring them not to plunder but to chastise the enemies of the people—the chancellor-archbishop, the treasurer, and the Duke of Lancaster. John of Gaunt was absent, Sudbury and Hales were safe in the Tower, but, at least, their houses might be sacked. Lambeth Palace had been dealt with on the preceding night, but there was a still prouder dwelling open to

CHAP. II. assault — the duke's great mansion of the Savoy, the most magnificent private residence in England. Thither Tyler directed his followers; and at about four o'clock in the afternoon the mob, swollen by thousands of London apprentices, artisans, and professional criminals, reached their goal. The doors were broken open, the furniture thrown out of the windows and hacked to pieces, the rich hangings and carpets torn up, the plate and ornaments battered and cast into the Thames. So anxious were the rioters to show that they came to punish not to steal, that a man caught making off with a silver goblet was promptly hanged. The Savoy was set on fire; it burnt all that night, not without loss of life, for thirty rioters of the baser sort, who had got to the wine cellar and there intoxicated themselves, were smothered without the knowledge of their friends.

The destroyers then turned against the Temple. Their object was twofold; the group of buildings belonged to the Knights Hospitallers, whose chief, Treasurer Hales, was reckoned the third greatest "traitor" in the realm. But the Temple was also the headquarters of the lawyers of England; here were their inns, their schools, and their library. Here lay stored the cursed parchments that were the ruin of honest men. The rioters broke open the church and burnt all the documents and books, they sacked the inns and chased away the men of law. "It was marvellous to see how even the most aged and infirm of them scrambled off, with the agility of rats or evil spirits."¹ A few were caught and killed. From the Temple the mob hurried off to another of Treasurer Hales' official abodes—the priory of St. John's Clerkenwell, headquarters of the Knights Hospitallers. The church, hospital, and mansion were burnt, and seven Flemings who had taken refuge at the altar were butchered. The busy day ended with the burning of the Fleet and Newgate prisons, after their inmates had been turned loose. Then the weary multitude sank down to sleep, the majority bivouacking round large fires kindled on the open spaces of Tower Hill and St. Catherine's wharf, where they could blockade the king and council in their last refuge. Only the leaders were still alert; it is said that they met in the house of

¹ Knighton, ii., 135.

Thomas Farringdon, the leader of the Essex men, and there drew up plans for the morrow, compiling a proscription list of all whom they deemed worthy of death.¹

The king and council, meanwhile, were holding a conclave within the Tower, while the flames of Clerkenwell and the Savoy lighted up the night. The blockaded magnates fell into two parties. One proposed to make a midnight sally at the head of the 600 or 800 armed men of their retinues and to fall upon the rebels while they slept. The mayor Walworth declared that he could raise several thousand loyalists from the city to aid them. The other section urged that night attacks are proverbially risky, and wished to see whether the rioters could not be dispersed by negotiation and reasonable concession. This party carried the day, and it was resolved that the king should grant on the following morning, Friday, the 14th, the interview that had been refused at Greenwich. Accordingly a proclamation was sent out to the rebels to the effect that Richard would meet them at Mile End, a favourite suburban promenade of the Londoners, outside the north-eastern gate of the city walls. The young monarch fully understood the danger of the experiment—it was possible that he might be seized or murdered—but he was apparently elated at the prospect of being able to put himself forward, and of showing what his personal influence was worth. It is said that he chose Mile End as the place of conference, because he hoped that, when the rebels moved off from about the Tower, Sudbury, Hales and other compromised persons would have a chance of escaping.² If so, the device failed; Tyler left a select band to watch the fortress, and when the archbishop tried to escape by boat in the early morning, he was sighted, pursued, and hunted back into the water-gate.

The king's ride to Mile End was perilous in the extreme. A frantic mob surrounded his escort; once the rebel chief Farringdon seized his bridle rein, clamouring for the death of the traitor Hales, and a scuffle, which could only have ended

¹ This we have from the indictment of Farringdon printed in André Réville's collection of documents of 1381, p. 195 (see Appendix on Authorities).

² We may, I think, reject the venomous suggestion in *Chron. Angl.*, p. 290, that Richard quitted the Tower, deliberately leaving it open, in order to let the rebels enter and slay the scapegoats. It is incredible that Richard should have left his mother in the Tower if he intended it to be sacked during his absence.

CHAP. II. in murder, nearly began.¹ But at last the trysting-place was reached, and Tyler and his chief captains faced Richard and the handful of magnates who accompanied him. The conference occupied some time, and was tumultuous in the extreme: at least one person was slain during the proceedings.² But the king came prepared to grant almost anything, and the leaders of the insurgents found that their demands were conceded one after another. Tyler himself was their spokesman: the topics which he at first brought forward were mainly connected with manorial grievances. The king consented that serfdom should be abolished all over the realm, that all feudal services should disappear, and that all holders in villeinage should become free tenants, paying the moderate annual rent of fourpence an acre to their lords. In addition, all restrictions on free buying and selling should be swept away, and the market monopolies of all favoured places should disappear. A general amnesty was to be given for all irregularities committed during the rising, and the king promised to give his banner to chosen representatives of each county present, as a token that he had taken them under his protection. As a sign of the honesty of his intentions, he set thirty clerks to draw up charters bestowing the promised immunities on the various hundreds and townships there represented. A great number of these documents were issued that day, and the formulæ have been preserved in more than one copy.

There remained only the question of the punishment of the "traitors". Tyler pressed the king hard. "The commons," he said, "will that you give them leave to take and deal with all those men who have sinned against you and the law." Richard replied, in a temporising fashion, that they should have for due punishment such persons as should be proved by the law of the land to be traitors. But justice after due trial was not what the insurgent chief wished to secure. While the king was still at Mile End distributing charters and banners, Tyler went off with a small band of personal followers and joined the force of rioters whom he had left to blockade the Tower. Either by

¹ All this is taken from the sheriffs' report, in Réville's Documents, pp. 195-96.

² His name was John French: nothing more is known of him. See Réville, p. lxxxviii., and *Archæologia Cantiana*, iii., 95.

mere mismanagement, or to show an ostentatious confidence in the people, the drawbridge of the fortress had not been raised nor the portcullis lowered. When Tyler and his gang came pouring in, the captain of the gate was struck with irresolution, and let them pass. Probably he thought that, if he offered resistance, the king and his escort, who were still at the rebels' mercy, might be massacred. The intruders did not attack the soldiery, indeed they showed an uncouth friendliness, shaking their hands, stroking their beards, and telling them that for the future they were all brothers and equals. Separating into several bands, they ran through the wards and towers seeking their destined victims: Tyler and Thomas Farringdon are recorded to have been at the head of the hunt. They invaded the king's private chambers, and frightened the Princess of Wales into a faint by offering to kiss her. The chroniclers pour scorn on the knights and squires of the garrison, who allowed a half-armed mob, less than a thousand strong, to run riot unchecked through every corner of the fortress.

The victims for whom Tyler was searching were found without much trouble. The archbishop, after his futile attempt to escape in the morning, had retired to the chapel in the White Tower, where he said mass, and confessed and communicated Treasurer Hales, the other minister whose death was certain if the rebels captured the fortress. They spent several hours in agonised expectation, reciting the penitential psalms, till the tumult in the court below told them that the enemy had broken in. When the rioters rushed into the chapel shouting, "Where is the traitor, the spoiler of the commons?" Sudbury boldly stood forward answering, almost in the same words used by Becket two centuries before, "Here am I, your archbishop and no traitor or spoiler". But they rushed upon him, cruelly buffeted him, and dragged him down the stairs and out of the castle to Tower Hill. There they hacked off his head on a log of wood; the treasurer was executed after him, and then two (or perhaps five¹) other persons. One was John Legge who had farmed the poll tax, another William Appleton, a Franciscan friar who was physician to John of Gaunt and passed for

¹ Only the continuator of Knighton adds that three more heads fell, those of three *Socii* of Legge in the collection of the poll tax.

CHAP. one of his chief political advisers. The heads of Sudbury and
 II. Hales were borne round the city on pikes, and then fixed over London bridge.

Simon of Sudbury seems to have been an honest, pious, and charitable man, his only crime was that he did not understand the times in which he lived. He died like a martyr because he had not lived like a statesman. A fighting chancellor might perhaps have checked the rebellion at its outset, but this weak well-intentioned man watched it grow without making any attempt to defend himself or his king, and wished to resign his seals when it came surging up to the walls of the Tower. It is curious to find that his contemporaries did not attempt to make a saint of him, in spite of his many virtues and his courageous end. But the clerical caste resented his mild treatment of the Lollards.

Hearing, as he rode back from Mile End, that the rebels were in the Tower, King Richard swerved aside at Aldgate, and established himself at the Queen's Wardrobe near St. Paul's, where his mother the Princess of Wales had also taken refuge. There his clerks were busy engrossing charters and pardons all that evening. Furnished with these tokens of their triumph, many thousands of the rebels went home: "the simple and the honest folk and the beginners in treason departed," but there remained the demagogues, the fanatics, and the criminals, who were not to be satisfied by any mere abolition of serfdom or feudal dues. Tyler and his friends were more busy than ever that night, and still had with them "thirty thousand more who were in no hurry to get their seals and charters from the king".

It would need a pamphlet of considerable bulk to relate all the recorded doings of the rebels in the eighteen hours that followed the meeting at Mile End. They ranged from wholesale murder to the extortion of shillings by dreadful threats from clergymen and old ladies.¹ The most bloody feature of the tumult was the slaughter of foreigners. Nearly two hundred in all were murdered, including thirty-four Flemings in one batch in the church of St. Martin's Vintry. With them all manner of unpopular Londoners met their death. Tyler himself went in search of the financier Richard Lyons

¹ For such cases see Réville's Documents, pp. 209, 215.

and cut off his head, in revenge, as we are told, for ancient chastisement received at his hands.¹ Disorderly bands went about putting to passers-by the shibboleth, "With whom hold ye?" and if the interlocutor failed to answer, "With King Richard and the true commons," they tore off his hood, haled him to one of the blocks they had placed at street corners and beheaded him. The larger number of the victims were lawyers, jurymen of the city, persons connected with the levying of taxes, or known adherents of the Duke of Lancaster. There was even more arson and plunder than mere slaughter; John Horn, the traitor alderman, went about with a crowd at his heels bidding any man who wanted his rights to apply to him; he levied fines, burnt bills and deeds, dispossessed householders, and generally, as his indictment sets forth, "usurped the royal privileges of justice". He was but one of many busy at similar business that night.

Yet the evil was beginning to cure itself: the conduct of the mob was growing so intolerable that every man who had anything to lose saw that he must prepare to defend his life and his property. There were many colloquies among the citizens that night, and next day the friends of order were ready to turn out *en masse* to save themselves, their property and—incidentally—their king. Yet Saturday morning opened gloomily enough: some early-rising rioters murdered John Imworth, warden of the Marshalsea, at dawn, tearing the wretched man from the shrine of St. Edward in Westminster Abbey, to which he clung till he was dragged off by force. The state of mind of the king's councillors is sufficiently shown by the fact that, instead of attempting to raise the loyalists in arms, they tried to resume negotiations with Tyler, in the hope that he might be induced by further concessions to withdraw his horde. This time the conference was to be not at Mile End, but at Smithfield, a space partly enclosed by houses outside Aldersgate, where the cattle-market was wont to be held. It was felt that the meeting would be even more perilous than the last, and Richard prepared for it by taking the sacrament and making a long confession of his boyish sins to an anchorite. He then rode to Smithfield with a retinue of

¹ See p. 35.

CHAP. 200 persons, many of whom were wearing armour concealed
II. under their gowns.

The king and his party drew rein on the east side of Smithfield, opposite St. Bartholomew's Church. All along the western and northern sides were the rebels, drawn up in tolerable order. The middle space was clear. Presently Tyler rode out from their ranks, mounted on a little hackney, with a single horseman bearing his banner behind him. He alighted, made a reverence to the king, and then seized his hand and shook it heartily, bidding him be of good cheer. Of the conversation that followed we have several accounts, varying considerably in detail. Tyler, it would seem,¹ announced that there were many additional points which required to be settled over and above the grants made at Mile End. He required that the abolition of the game-laws and several other items should be added to the charter, and then launched out into higher politics. "There should be no law save the law of Winchester;² no man should be outlawed as the result of any legal proceedings; lords should no longer hold lordship except civilly (whatever that may exactly mean); the estates of the Church, after provision made for the present holders, should be confiscated, and divided up among the laity; the bishoprics should be abolished all save one; lastly, all men should be equally free, and no legal status should differentiate one man from another, save the king alone." Such a programme could not be settled off-hand in Smithfield; if Tyler really broached it, he must have been set on provoking opposition, or at least hoped that the king and council would ask for delay and discussion. Either would suit him well, as an excuse for keeping his bands together, or even for seizing the person of his master.

Richard replied that the commons should have all that he could give, "saving the regalities of the crown"; this was no answer at all, for much of what Tyler demanded could not be granted by royal fiat without the consent of parliament. Then came a pause; no one said a word more, "for no lord or councillor dared to open his mouth in answer to the commons at

¹ I follow in all this the Chronicle printed in the *English Historical Review* by Mr. Trevelyan, the best narrative of the Smithfield proceedings.

² Apparently a confused reference to the police provisions of Edward I.'s statute of Winchester.

such a moment". Tyler, apparently taking the king's reply as a practical refusal, began to grow unmannerly. He called for a flagon of beer, which was brought him by one of his men, drained it at a draught—the day was hot and he had made a long speech—and then remounted his horse. At that moment a Kentishman, who was riding behind the king, remarked in audible tones that he recognised Tyler, and knew him for one of the most notorious highwaymen and thieves in his county. The rebel caught the words, looked round at the speaker, and bade him come out from among the others, "wagging his head at him in his malice". When he refused to stir, Tyler turned to the man who was bearing his banner, and bade him draw his sword and cut down the varlet. At this the Kentishman cried out that he had spoken the truth and done nought to deserve death, whereupon Tyler unsheathed a dagger which he had been holding in his grip throughout the debate, and pushed in among the royal retinue, apparently intending to take vengeance into his own hands. Then Walworth, the mayor, faced him and cried that he would arrest him for drawing his weapon before the king. Tyler replied by stabbing at the mayor, but as Walworth was wearing a coat-of-mail under his gown he took no harm. Whipping out a short cutlass he struck back, and wounded the rebel in the shoulder, beating him down on to his horse's neck. A second after one John Standwich, a squire of the king, ran him twice through the body with his sword. Tyler mortally wounded, had just strength to turn his horse out of the press; he rode half-way across the square, cried "Treason!" and then rolled out of his saddle in the empty space in sight of the whole assembly.

This was the most critical moment of the whole rebellion; there seemed every probability that Richard and all his followers would be massacred. A confused cry ran through the rebel ranks: they bent their bows, untrussed their sheaves of arrows, and in ten seconds more would have begun to shoot into the clump of horsemen massed in front of the gate of St. Bartholomew's. But the young king rose to the occasion with a cool courage and presence of mind that showed him the true son of the Black Prince. Spurring his steed right out into the open, he cantered towards the rebels, throwing up his right hand to wave them back, and crying: "Sirs, will you shoot

CHAP. II. your king? I will be your chief and captain, you shall have from me all that you seek. Only follow me to the fields without." So saying he pointed to the open meadows about St. John's Clerkenwell, just north of Smithfield, and rode forth into them at a slow walk. After a moment's hesitation the rebels began to stream out after him: some of the royal retinue, mingled with the crowd, followed as best they could. But Walworth, the mayor, turned back hastily to the city gate to bring up all the loyalists that he could find and rescue the boy from his perilous position. For the danger was not over; nothing was more likely than that an affray might still be provoked by Tyler's adherents.

All now depended on the proceedings of the mayor and the promptness of his friends in rallying. Riding in at Aldersgate, Walworth sent messages in every direction; in a few minutes there was a stir, and armed men came hurrying in from all directions. It was in vain that the traitor alderman Walter Sibley tried to disperse the gathering array in Eastcheap, swearing that he had seen the king killed, and that the wisest thing would be to close the gates. In less than an hour Walworth had several thousand men at his back; for the events of the last two days had turned even lukewarm citizens into hot loyalists. Sallying forth into the fields the mayor found the king still safe, talking against time and parleying with strange interlocutors, for John Ball and other extremists were in the press. The mayor led his bands to the front, ranged them about the king, and asked for his orders. It is said that some of the courtiers advised Richard to fall upon the mob, but he replied in wrath: "Three-fourths of these folk have been brought here by fear and threats, I will not have the innocent suffer for the guilty". He simply proclaimed to the multitude that he gave them leave to depart; many, it is said, fell down on their knees and blessed him for his clemency. Then they dispersed in all directions. While Richard sat triumphant, watching the crowd melt away, the mayor brought him the head of Tyler, the only rebel that died that day. The king ordered it to be taken to London bridge, there to replace the head of Archbishop Sudbury. He knighted Walworth, three aldermen, Philpot, Bramber, and Launde, with John Standwich who had actually slain the rebel chief, and then rode home to the Wardrobe. His mother met him crying, as we are told:

"Ah, fair son, what pain and anguish have I had for you this day!" To which he made reply: "Certes, madam, I know it well. But now rejoice, and praise God, for to-day I have recovered my heritage that was lost, and the realm of England." Well might he make the boast, for his own courage and presence of mind had saved the situation, and turned the perilous conference of Smithfield into a triumph. What might not have been hoped from a boy who at the age of fourteen was capable of such an achievement?

In following Tyler to his end we have been drawn on beyond the strict chronological sequence of events. Some days before the tragedy in Smithfield other parts of England, beyond Kent and Essex, had caught the flame of revolt and were up in arms. But before dealing with their tumults, it is convenient to make an end of the history of the revolt in the home counties. Tyler's followers had dispersed with their charters, doubting, rightly enough, whether those hardly-won documents were worth the parchment on which they were engrossed. The initiative had passed out of their hands into those of the king and his councillors. Surrounded by the mass of armed London burghers, and with reinforcements dropping in each day, as the squires of the south-eastern counties came flocking into the capital with their retainers, the government could at last take measures to suppress the anarchy which still reigned all around. The advisers who had most weight for the moment were the Earl of Arundel, and the king's uncle, Thomas of Buckingham, who had come hurrying in from the Welsh march a little too late for the crisis at Smithfield. London was very quickly pacified. On the night of June 15 the king gave dictatorial authority to a commission composed of Walworth, Philpot, and Bramber, joining with them the old condottiere Sir Robert Knowles. Authorised to deal with criminals "either according to the law of England, or by other ways and means," they seized and hanged several chiefs, including Robert Starling, the Essex man who had actually beheaded Sudbury, and Jack Straw, Tyler's most prominent lieutenant. The latter left behind him a curious confession, which may or may not contain an element of truth. He asserted that Tyler had intended to seize the king at Smithfield, to hold him as a hostage, and to use

CHAP. II. the royal name as a cloak for arresting and executing many magnates, and for confiscating the property of the Church. Finally they would have killed the king and made such laws as pleased themselves. How much of this was the bravado of despair, how much a real revelation of Tyler's schemes, no man can say.

London being pacified, the king marched on the 22nd into Essex, the shire where the rising seemed least inclined to die down, sending his brother, Thomas Holland, and the constable of Dover to deal with Kent, which was less disturbed. In the latter county there was no fighting; the rebel bands dispersed on every side; but Essex made more resistance. When the king reached Waltham, on the 23rd, he was met by a deputation, who asked him to confirm all the Mile End charters. Richard gave them no uncertain answer. "Villeins ye are still, and villeins ye shall remain," he exclaimed, adding that pledges given under duress went for nothing. It is clear that the sentimental sympathy for the oppressed peasantry attributed to the young king by some modern writers is a vain imagining. Angered rather than terrified by the king's harsh words, the Essex chiefs ordered their followers to muster in arms and resist the royal army. A considerable force was gathered, and entrenched itself in a strong position between two woods near Billericay. On the 28th the king's advance guard, under Thomas of Buckingham and Sir Henry Percy, attacked it, and routed it after a sharp fight. Five hundred insurgents are said to have fallen. The wrecks of the horde retired on Colchester, and tried to persuade the townsmen to continue the struggle. Meeting no encouragement, they broke up into two bands and fled north; one party was exterminated at Sudbury, another at Ramsey, by local loyalists.

When the fighting was ended, the king ordered the chief justices Tressilian and Belknap to hold a special assize, the one in Essex, the other in Kent. The names of 110 persons who suffered capital punishment have been collected,¹ but on the whole the proceedings of the justices seem to have been more moderate, and the observance of forms of law more complete than might have been expected. No one appears to have

¹ By the painstaking industry of M. Réville; see his reprint of the "indictments," in his already quoted work.

been put to death untried, save those who fell in battle at Billericay, and the few leaders executed in London by Walworth's commission. Among the persons formally tried John Ball was the most important. He fled to Coventry after Tyler's death, was there detected, and was brought before Chief Justice Tressilian at St. Albans. On July 13 he was indicted, and fearlessly avowed that he had taken a leading part in the rising. He owned that the incendiary letters sent round Kent were of his writing, denied that any of his deeds were blameworthy, and refused to sue for pardon. At the request of Bishop Courtenay, he was given two days to make his peace with God, and then hung, drawn, and quartered.

On August 30 Richard and his council issued orders that all further arrests and executions were to cease. This brought the hangings to an end, and one after another the surviving prisoners were pardoned and released. Among those who escaped with a shorter or a longer term of imprisonment were aldermen Horn and Sibley, Farringdon, and Cave, the first leader of the Kentish rebels before the advent of Tyler. All except Cave were released before April, 1385.

Though every region of eastern and south-eastern England was more or less affected by the insurrection, the only district where it raged as fiercely as in Kent or Essex was East Anglia—the three counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Cambridge. Outside this focus the troubles were no more than the ground-swell spreading outward from the central disturbance that had burst so fiercely on London. But this ground-swell beat somewhat furiously on the suburban shires of Surrey and Hertford. We can trace disturbances at Croydon, Kingston-on-Thames, Harrow, Barnet, Dunstable, St. Albans. Inhabitants of scores of villages in both counties are to be found in the list of persons excluded from the king's general pardon issued on December 14, 1381.

The case of St. Albans is the only one that presents points of special interest. Here the rising of 1381 was but an incident in a long and venomous struggle between the abbots and the townsfolk, which can be traced back to 1314, and even to 1274. The place had grown up on the demesne of the abbey, and remained a mere manor, governed autocratically by the monks, who carefully retained every petty feudal custom

CHAP. II. that dated back to the eleventh century, and would never grant even the mildest charter of liberties. On June 13, the day when Tyler entered London, the men of St. Albans rose to demand their freedom from Abbot Thomas de la Mare. They sent deputies to the Mile End conference, procured one of the king's charters, and also enlisted Tyler's special interest in their proceedings. Armed with the royal warrant they broke down the hedges of the abbot's park, killed his game, and selected allotments among the fields of his home-farms. They also entered his jail and slew one of his captives, whose head they fixed on the pillory, along with a dead rabbit from the manorial warren. Next day the townsfolk forced their lord to grant them an ample charter, conceding all manorial liberties and considerable powers of self-government. But on the day following came the news of Tyler's fall; and shortly afterwards the time of repression and punishment arrived. Though the men of St. Albans, after much haggling, made peace with their abbot and surrendered their charter, they could not save themselves from chastisement at the hands of Justice Tressilian. Three of their prominent leaders were hung; the chief of these, one William Grindcob, is one of the few figures among the rebels of 1381 who rouse our admiration by their courageous bearing and evident disinterestedness. His valedictory speech to his fellow-townsmen has a fine ring, even when reported by the unsympathetic pen of the monastic chronicler. "Friends, who after so long an age of oppression have at last won yourselves a short breath of freedom, hold firm while you can, and have no thought for me or what I may suffer. For if I die for the cause of the liberty that we lately won, I think myself happy to end my life as a martyr."¹ He was the first to be hung, and St. Albans had to wait till the Reformation for the municipal liberty of which he had dreamed.

There were troubles in Hampshire and Sussex, but nothing to compare with the tumults in the home-counties. The most important episode in this region seems to have been a rising in Winchester, where the craftsmen attacked the burgess-oligarchy. They were led, as was so often the case in town quarrels, by a discontented member of the governing clique, a wealthy draper, who sued for, and obtained, his pardon in the

¹ Walsingham, ii., 40-41.

following year. Wiltshire seems to have been hardly disturbed at all : the royal escheator, when asked in 1382 to render an account of the goods of any rebels in the county, reported that he had none such to denounce. In Oxfordshire and Berkshire also there would seem to have been no appreciable trouble, though isolated individuals from these shires are scheduled as having taken part in the London riots.

But when we cast our eyes eastward we find a very different state of affairs. In East Anglia the rising was universal; the towns and the rural districts being equally affected, though the grievances of peasants and townsfolk were entirely different. The movement received its original impulse from London and Essex, but its history was not intimately connected with the vicissitudes of Tyler's fortune, and continued for some time after his death. The first leader of insurrection in East Anglia was John Wraw, a priest, who had lately held the vicarage of Ringsfield, near Beccles. He appeared on the borders of Suffolk on June 12, fresh, it is said, from an interview with the malcontents in London, and possibly after having taken counsel with Tyler himself. The news from Kent was so well known that the moment he set up the "banner of the commons" he was joined by hundreds of local rioters, and other bands started up on every side within the next three days. Rebellions do not flare up in this sudden fashion unless the ground is ready beforehand. It seems at first surprising that the outburst was more universal in the wealthy counties of Norfolk and Suffolk than in the poorer regions of the midlands. But though the economic condition of those counties compared favourably with that of any other part of the realm, it would seem that nowhere was there a more flagrant diversity between the status of different sections of the population. Side by side with towns like Norwich and Yarmouth, which enjoyed the best possible charters, were others like Bury St. Edmunds and Lynn, which were gripped in the dead hand of the Church and were denied the common municipal rights. And if among the villages there were some where the old preponderance of the freeman (so prominent in the Norfolk of Domesday Book) had never disappeared, there were others where the manorial system reigned in its most extreme form, and every due and service was rigidly exacted. We can detect in East Anglia all the factors of discontent that are to

CHAP. be found in the other disturbed districts—hatred of hard land-
II. lords, clerical or lay, grievances in the towns against the local oligarchy, political discontent against the king's council and officers.

It would be rash to add to these the possible influence of Wycliffite doctrines, as some historians have done. Though afterwards a great centre of Lollardy, East Anglia showed in 1381 no signs of being actuated by religious motives. If clerical landlords were attacked, it was because they were landlords, not because they were clerks. If a surprising number of priests appear among the rebel chiefs, it was because they were poor and discontented, not because they were fanatical reformers. A special feature in the eastern insurrection is that a large sprinkling of the rebel leaders were drawn from the governing classes—a thing quite unknown in Kent and Essex. Two squires were implicated in the rising at Bury; a knight, bearing the honoured name of Roger Bacon, directed the sack of Yarmouth; another, named Sir Thomas Cornerd, was one of Wraw's lieutenants. In addition, members of well-known county families, such as Richard and John Tollemache, James Bedingfield, Thomas de Monchensey, William Lacy, are found taking an active part in deeds of murder and pillage. After studying the details of their work, we are driven to the conclusion that they were merely unquiet spirits, who took advantage of an outbreak of anarchy to revenge old grudges or plunder their neighbours. It is impossible to recognise in them (as some have done) "liberal" members of the upper classes who endeavoured to guide the revolt into channels of reform. The genuine reformer does not occupy himself in levying blackmail, or endeavouring to compel his neighbours to sell him their manors at a nominal price. It seems that in East Anglia every man with a grievance and every reckless ruffian utilised the revolt for his own ends.

The actual start of the rising was on the border of Essex and Suffolk upon June 12. On that day John Wraw led his band to sack the manor of the financier Richard Lyons, whom Tyler murdered in London on the next day but one. On the 13th Wraw marched on Bury St. Edmunds. This town, like St. Albans, was in the hands of the Church, and had been maintaining for many generations an intermittent warfare with the monks of the great abbey who were its lords. Like the men

of St. Albans the men of Bury thought that the time had come for extorting a charter of liberties, and they were particularly favoured by the fact that the abbacy was at the moment vacant. Accordingly they summoned in Wraw and his peasants to their aid, and helped him to sack the houses of the abbey officials. Prior Cambridge, who was the *interim* administrator of the monastery, and the head of the party which refused all concessions to the townsmen, fled. But he was betrayed by a treacherous guide and given over to Wraw, who had gone in pursuit of him as far as Mildenhall. The rebel priest gave him a mock trial and decapitated him. Soon after another band of rioters brought to Wraw an even more important capture, Sir John Cavendish, chief justice of the king's bench, who had been taken as he was flying from his manor of Cavendish toward Ely. His head also was smitten off, and carried with that of the prior to the market-place of Bury, where they were set up on the pillory. Other such trophies were ere long planted around and beneath them. After these warnings it was not likely that the trembling monks of Bury would hesitate when a charter of liberties was demanded from them. It was hastily drawn up and sealed; all the muniments, plate, and treasure of the house were at once sequestered by the municipal authorities whom the charter created.

For a week John Wraw reigned at Bury, sending out his lieutenants on all sides to spread the revolt and to extort blackmail wherever it could be got. His main agents were a renegade knight, named Sir Thomas Cornerd, and two priests from Sudbury. His sphere of operations extended as far as Bungay and Beccles, but Ipswich and the shoreland of Suffolk had a separate revolution of their own, led by John Battisford, vicar of Bucklersham, and a wealthy farmer named Thomas Sampson. Comparing the troubles of the two halves of Suffolk, it would seem that both were equally zealous in the burning of manor rolls and the levying of blackmail, but that the Ipswich bands were less given to murder and arson than those which operated from Bury.

In Norfolk again we find a totally independent insurrection on foot; Wraw had no influence beyond the Waveney, save by the fact that he started the first troubles by the force of his example. On the 14th, the day after Wraw seized Bury,

CHAP. II. agitators began "riding from village to village, raising the hue and cry, and calling the commons to rise against the crown and laws of England".¹ By the 16th all Norfolk was aflame, little knowing that the death-blow to the rebellion had already been dealt in London the day before, by the slaughter of Tyler and the dispersion of his host. In the western half of the great county the rising was anarchic and unorganised; from the bulky rolls of the indictments drawn up in July we get the picture of a whole region given over for ten days to objectless pillage. In eastern Norfolk, on the other hand, the rebels fell under the influence of a single capable leader, the only man save Tyler who appreciated the magnitude of his opportunity; for the miserable Wraw was a petty-minded creature who thought of nothing but filling his pockets. Geoffrey Litster, a dyer of Felmingham, clearly possessed the capacity to attract and to retain obedience, and for a short week was undisputed master from Holt and Cromer as far as Yarmouth and Diss. He was a busy enterprising man with a real programme, in which we trace attempts to conform to the propaganda that had been working in Kent and London. His right-hand man and chief executive officer was that unquiet knight Sir Roger Bacon of Baconsthorpe. How it came to pass that the dyer gave orders and the knight executed them we cannot guess, but such was the case. On the 17th Litster had collected a great assembly on Mousehold Heath, outside Norwich, in order to beset the city. There he caught Sir Robert Salle, an old soldier who refused to join his band, and who taunted him with such plain words that he was promptly beheaded. Affrighted by Litster's threats the citizens of Norwich opened their gates to him, and paid a large fine, on condition that the "true commons" should abstain from theft, murder, and arson. The pact was not fully kept, for Litster, though he kept his followers from general massacre, executed one Reginald Eccles, a justice of the peace, and gave up to sack the houses of some unpopular burgesses. That night he banqueted in the castle, compelling four captive knights named Morley, Scales, Hales, and Brues, to serve him as his chamberlain, steward, butler, and carver. Struck with the splendour of the spectacle the rebels saluted him as "king

¹ Réville's Documents, p. 115.

of the commons," a title in which he gloried during the short week that he had still to live. CHAP. II.

King Geoffrey was no mere spectacular monarch. Next morning he had sent out bands in every direction, who came back bringing piles of court-rolls and manorial records to be burned before his door. The chief band, under Sir Roger Bacon, captured Yarmouth on the 18th, tore up the town charter, which was obnoxious to the villages around, and beheaded three Dutchmen and three Flemings. A considerable number of the wealthy burgesses saw their houses sacked; the rest got off by paying blackmail. This was the greatest achievement of Litster's host, "the great company" (*magna societas*), as it was called. The king of the commons himself visited all the more important places, and presided at many trials of "traitors"; a few were beheaded, and more fined. When he had got all eastern Norfolk in hand, Geoffrey took a step which shows him a provident man. On the 20th he resolved to send an embassy to the king, to request a general charter of manumission for all Norfolk villeins, and a pardon for himself and his followers for all irregularities committed during the past week. The mission consisted of two of his captive knights, Sir William Morley and Sir John Brues, with three local leaders bearing the euphonious names of Trunch, Skeet, and Kybytt. The ambassadors started from Norwich to take the roundabout road through Newmarket and Cambridge, but when they reached Icklingham, near Newmarket, there came a prompt end to their travels. They met the man who had taken in hand the suppression of the East Anglian rebellion, and who was now marching in haste to the recapture of Norwich.

But before relating the fall of the king of the commons we must cast a short glance at Cambridgeshire, which his ambassadors were just about to enter. This county had, during the five days that lay between June 14 and June 19, a history as exciting as that of Suffolk or Norfolk, though everything was, of course, on a smaller scale. The local rising was started partly by men who hurried down from London after Tyler's arrival, partly by stragglers from Wraw's Suffolk bands. There were attacks on local "traitors," and on monastic landlords, such as the great houses of Ely and Barnwell,

CHAP. II. As in Norfolk, several of the local gentry were implicated as leaders in the rising. But the peculiar interest of the Cambridge troubles lies in the assault on the university. This was an illustration of the general rule that in 1381 every discontented section of the nation fell upon its special enemy. In Cambridge the townsfolk had their grievance against the privileged clerks who dwelt in their midst under their own laws, and made light of municipal authority. After dealing with the prior of Barnwell, they turned upon the university, sacked Corpus Christi College and certain halls, hunted away the masters and scholars, and seized the University Church, where lay the academic muniments, in many great chests. These were all burnt in the market-place. It is recorded that an old woman named Margery Starre threw document after document into the flames, crying, "Away with the learning of clerks—away with it!" while the mob danced around in triumph. There was no such slaughter, however, as took place in Oxford at the similar outburst on St. Scholastica's day, 1354. The academic officials, whom the mob specially hunted, succeeded in hiding themselves.

The Cambridge rising was just spreading into the neighbouring shires northward and westward, Ramsey had been assaulted, Huntingdon threatened, and Peterborough was concerting an attack on its abbot, when a new figure appeared upon the scene. Of all the magnates of England the Bishop of Norwich was the only man who showed self-reliant energy in June, 1381. Henry Despenser, grandson of the well-known favourite of Edward II., had been a fighting man in his youth, and had seen service abroad in the cause of Urban V.; he still felt the helmet sit as naturally on his head as the mitre. He chanced to be absent from his diocese when the rebellion broke out, being at Burghley House, by Stamford town. The moment that he heard of the troubles he resolved to return to Norwich, though he must cut his way through a whole country-side up in arms. He had with him no more than his ordinary retinue, eight lances and a score of archers, but he set forth without hesitation. He was nearing Peterborough Abbey on the 16th when he fell in with the rebels. The tenants of that wealthy house had chosen that afternoon for their assault on the monks, and were actually plundering the offices of the monastery when the bishop rode

up. Catching them unawares, he hurled his little band upon them, and scared them into flight: many were cut down, some within the very walls of the abbey, others were caught and hung that same night. Tarrying a night only at Peterborough to gather in recruits from the local gentry, Despenser marched next day on Ramsey Abbey, where he found a band of rioters from Ely in possession of the place, and engaged in blackmailing the monks. Coming on them by surprise he took them all prisoners, and then pushed on to Cambridge, the centre of troubles in that region. He had now a force sufficient to overawe the mob of the borough, who made little or no resistance. The bishop seized and beheaded John Hanchach, a wealthy local landowner who had led the riot of the 16th, imprisoned many other persons, and deposed the mayor of Cambridge, who had shown himself incompetent or disaffected. After spending two days in restoring order in the town, Despenser turned eastward to enter his own diocese.

On the 22nd he met near Icklingham the ambassadors whom Litster had despatched to London. They ran unawares into his party and were arrested. On hearing their story, he rated the knights Morley and Brues for their cowardice in serving a traitor, and beheaded their colleagues Trunch, Skeet, and Kybytt by the wayside. The moment that his arrival was reported "all those knights and squires who had hidden themselves for fear of the commons, when they saw their bishop in helm and cuirass, girt with his two-edged sword, joined themselves to his company". It was at the head of a considerable force that he presented himself before the gates of Norwich on the 24th. The citizens at once opened them, and told him that Litster had marched off that morning with his horde, probably because he did not want to give battle in a place where the citizens were ready to betray him or attack him in the rear. The rebel retired a few miles, to North Walsham, where he stood at bay in a fortified position behind ditches and palisades, with his flanks covered by rows of carts chained wheel to wheel. The bishop pursued him next day, and stormed his entrenchments—charging at the head of his retainers and being the first man who cut his way through the palisades. Many rebels were slain, and more captured; among those last was the "king of the commons" himself. Despenser

CHAP. ordered him to be hung, and then, remembering his sacred
II. office, confessed the rebel and gave him absolution before he went to the halter.

With the death of Litster the Norfolk insurrection suddenly collapsed ; after the combat of North Walsham the surviving rebel bands dispersed, and the bishop found nothing left for him save the tedious task of tracking out and arresting the leaders. He hanged a few, but saved most for the justices, who came round in July to hold a regular assize, and executed some twenty or thirty persons more. Among these we do not find Sir Roger Bacon, who was imprisoned but released after a short term of punishment. Suffolk was pacified just as easily ; here the work of repression was done by the earl of the shire, William Ufford, who came up with 500 lances detached from the king's army in London. Wraw, the leading rebel, turned king's evidence when captured, and tried to save himself by giving information against all his own lieutenants. It placed the noose around the necks of several of them, but did not preserve his own miserable life. After the murders of the chief justice and the prior of Bury, he could not expect pardon, and suffered with about fifteen of his accomplices. There remained two guilty communities to be punished, the towns of Cambridge and Bury. The former was punished by being docked of many ancient privileges, which were handed over to the university. The oversight of the market and the management of Stourbridge fair, the great annual mart at which most of the business of the fenland was transacted, were both placed for the future under academic control. The men of Bury, whose case was even worse, were specially exempted from the general amnesty proclaimed by the king in December ; they were not inlawed until 1382, and then had to pay the enormous fine of 2,000 marks.

In the extreme west and north the outbreak had come very late, only when the news of Tyler's first successes filtered into the outlying parts of the realm. Nor was it vigorous save in a few places where local circumstances were specially propitious for trouble. There was no rising in the south-west save at Bridgwater, where a priest and a yeoman raised a riot against the Knights Hospitallers for purely private reasons. Oddly enough there was a similar isolated outburst against this order

in a region so remote from Bridgwater as Lincolnshire. In the west midlands we have no records of trouble in any shire, save an obscure rising in the Cheshire peninsula of Wirral; in the east midlands, owing, no doubt, to the vicinity of Cambridge, there were beginnings of riot in several counties, especially at Northampton, where a demagogue named William Napton attempted to stir up the lower orders against the mayor and town council. But all died down when the news of Bishop Despenser's victory was spread abroad. North of Humber there were three cases of serious insurrection, all in large towns. Two, at Scarborough and Beverley, seem to have been simple attacks on the local burgess-oligarchy by the local democracy. The third, that at York, bears witness to something like a state of endemic civil war between two turbulent factions. Any of these three risings might have taken place in another year; indeed at Beverley the rioting began as early as May 7, a month before the first stir in Essex, so that it clearly cannot be considered as a proper part of the great rebellion. At York two parties, headed respectively by the ex-mayor John Gisborne and his successor Simon Quixley, fought in the streets, and then denounced each other as rebels to the royal authorities. The government wisely replied by fining the whole city 1,000 marks.

It was not till the autumn was over that the ministry dared conclude that its troubles were at an end. We hear of half a dozen cases of bands reassembling in August or September, but in no instance was the attempt to stir up the embers of sedition successful. Only one of these abortive risings has any interest: in October we find that some obscure persons about Maidstone were scheming to raise a new insurrection in the name of John of Gaunt. This is surprising, since in June the duke had been one of the most unpopular persons in the realm,—it was the king who was to right all grievances. But Richard's revocation of the Mile End charters, and his testy "villeins ye are, and villeins ye shall remain," had changed the views of the southern peasantry. We are told that they had heard that Lancaster had been liberal in granting exemptions from manorial dues and customs to his tenants in the north, and so had conceived a new regard for him. But the plot was betrayed, and extinguished ere it came into action.

CHAP.
II.

All serious danger had passed when, on November 13, the parliament met at Westminster. It sat for a month, was prorogued for the Christmas holidays, and came together for a second session from January 27 to February 25, 1382. Its policy, as might have been expected after the experiences of its individual members in June, was reactionary. One of its first acts was to pass a bill of indemnity for all those who, like Mayor Walworth in London, and Bishop Despenser in Norfolk, had put rebels to death without a due form of trial. The ministers who now met the two houses as successors of the murdered Sudbury and Hales were Lancaster's old enemy Bishop Courtenay, as chancellor, and Sir Hugh Segrave as treasurer. Segrave took the main part in laying the problems of the day before the Commons. He explained that the king, while under constraint, had issued many charters of enfranchisement to villeins. Such documents were null and void, because their master had no power to grant away the rights of his subjects without the consent of parliament. But he was informed that certain lords of manors were desirous of manumitting and enfranchising their villeins of their own free will. If this were so, the king would have no objection to sanctioning such emancipations. This proposal was strange: the council must have known perfectly well that the two houses did not feel in a kindly mood towards villeins at this moment. Did they wish to throw all the responsibility for the retention of villeinage on the parliament? Or was there some feeble working of conscience in the young king's mind, causing him to make a tentative representation in favour of the peasants, to whom he had sworn such great oaths? Whatever was the object of the proposal, it received a peremptory answer. "Prelates, lords temporal, knights, citizens, and burgesses, responded with one voice that the repealing of the charters was well done. They added that no manumission could legally have been given without their own consent, as they had the main interest in the matter. And for their own parts they would never consent of their free will nor otherwise, nor would they do it even to save themselves from sudden death."¹

Immediately after this declaration Courtenay resigned the

¹*Rot. Parl.*, iii., 100.

great seal, and was replaced as chancellor by Richard Lord Scrope, who had already held the office in the years 1378-80. At the same time a petition was made that the king's household might be changed. Richard made no objection, and in due course the Earl of Arundel and Michael Lord de la Pole were given him as tutors "pour gouverner et conseiller sa personne". We have already heard of Arundel, whose conduct as a fighting man was not above suspicion, but who passed as a skilled admiral and something of a statesman. De la Pole was a new peer, the son of a Hull merchant, who had served Edward III. from early youth as a soldier and diplomatist. It is curious to note that the two men thus associated by parliament were to become one the king's greatest enemy, the other his closest friend. Both ended disastrously, Arundel on the scaffold for crossing Richard's plans, De la Pole in exile for serving him too zealously.

The ministry having been reconstituted, the next step of the Commons was to petition the king for a general amnesty to those who had taken part in the rebellion, save certain notable chiefs and malefactors. This was granted, the exceptions running up to 187 names. All these persons, from Sir Roger Bacon, the recreant knight, and Alderman Sibley, the betrayer of London bridge, down to Cave, the baker of Dartford, ultimately obtained their liberty after a shorter or a longer imprisonment, and a heavier or a lighter fine. The towns of Cambridge, Canterbury, Bridgwater, Beverley, and Scarborough were also pardoned; Bury St. Edmunds alone was kept out of the royal grace until 1386, when it paid the last instalment of its fine of 2,000 marks.

It remains to estimate the general results of the great convulsion of 1381. The popular theory down to the last few years was that the formal victory lay with the land-holding classes, but the real success with the peasant; that the war of 1381 had as its effect the practical extinction of villeinage, though the parliament refused emancipation with such a vast show of indignation.¹ Later research has shown that such a summary of the result of the insurrection is far too sweeping, and is not founded on a sufficiently broad basis of observed facts in manorial records. It is true that serfdom was in

¹ Cf. Thorold Rogers, *Work and Wages*, pp. 268-71.

CHAP.
II.

decline during the latter part of the fourteenth century, and still more so in the early years of the fifteenth. But the immediate consequence of the rising does not seem to have been any general abandonment by the lords of their disputed rights. Indeed the manorial records of the years 1382 and 1383 show instances which prove that the first result of the suppression of the rebellion was to encourage many lords to reassert old rights, and to tighten the relaxed bonds of serfdom.¹ Now in their moment of triumph, it would be easy to reassert old privileges. We may well believe that many lords were taught caution by the events of June, 1381, and worked the machinery of the manor with more moderation for the future. But there can be no doubt that in most regions the old system went on; it had received a rude shock, but it had not been put completely out of gear. The best proof of this is that the manorial archives of the next ten years are full of conflicts between landlord and villein precisely similar to those which were rife in the years before the great rising. If we had not the story of Tyler and Ball, Wraw and Litster preserved in the chronicles and the judicial proceedings, we should never have guessed from a mere study of court-rolls that there had been an earth-shaking convulsion in 1381.

The general deduction which we are forced to draw is that if villeinage transformed itself into free tenures, and largely disappeared during the fifty years that followed the great rising, it was not in direct consequence of that rising, but as a result of the rural economic revolution of the fifteenth century. The lords preferred, more and more, to work their estates in pasturage rather than in arable, and this being so, they had less and less interest year by year to exact the old servile *corvées*.² Villeinage disappeared by slow degrees, and from economic causes. It was not killed once and for all by the armed force of rebellion in June, 1381.

¹ For cases see Powell's *East Anglian Rising*, pp. 64-65; for the survival of villeinage see Cuninghame's *Growth of English Industry*, i., 402-3.

² See Réville, Preface, p. cxxxii.

CHAPTER III.

LAST YEARS OF THE MINORITY. WYCLIFFE AND THE CRUSADE.

CHAP.
III.

IT is time to return to the normal annals of the realm, after following out to its end the great rebellion of 1381. The most notable feature of the domestic politics of the succeeding year is an improvement in the relations of John of Gaunt with the court.¹ Apparently the young king was so indignant at the humiliation which he himself had suffered at the hands of Tyler's horde, that he was inclined to look more favourably on an uncle who had been a prominent object of hatred to the insurgents. At any rate he resented in the strongest fashion an insult put upon the duke by the Earl of Northumberland, and forced the offender to make ample apology for having refused with contumely to admit his uncle into Bamborough Castle when he was on his way home from Edinburgh.² Lancaster, on the other hand, must have been profoundly impressed at the evidences of his own unpopularity, and must have seen that it would be unwise to make himself over-prominent in politics at present. It is certain that for some time his conduct was unexceptionable.

When parliament reassembled on January 27, 1382, it had leisure at last to deal with other matters than those arising out of the insurrection. The two houses had to salute a new Queen of England. Tender though the king's years were, his council had for some time been endeavouring to find a bride for him. There had been negotiations as early as 1379 for a marriage with Katharine the daughter of Bernabo Visconti of Milan, and in 1380 for a match with another

¹ For full details see Armitage-Smith's *John of Gaunt*, pp. 250-55.

² See Knighton, ii., 147.

CHAP.
III.

Katharine, daughter of Lewis, Duke of Bavaria. But a more splendid alliance was finally concluded with the sister of the monarch who held the highest titular dignity in Christendom, Wenceslaus, King of Bohemia and emperor-elect. This prince had already espoused the cause of Pope Urban in the dispute roused by the Great Schism, and so taken the anti-French side ; it was hoped in England that he might be induced to stir up all Germany for an attack on the schismatic king Charles VI. It was a vain hope, and Wenceslaus turned out an incapable sot, and a broken reed for all who leaned upon him. But no one could have foreseen this in 1381 ; a connexion with him was hailed with joy by the whole realm, and when it was announced in December that the Princess Anne had arrived at Calais, the realm made ready to receive her with enthusiasm. On December 21 she crossed the straits and landed at Dover, and on January 14 following, just before parliament met, was wedded to King Richard in Westminster Abbey. She was fifteen years old, exactly the same age as her husband. Though not gifted with great personal beauty, she was amiable and accomplished above the average of the princesses of her day. Her father the Emperor Charles IV. had been a lover of learning, and she had received an excellent education, and could read and write Latin as well as German. Few of the queens of medieval England have such a clean political and personal record as Anne of Bohemia earned in the twelve years of her married life. Her influence was ever used upon the right side, she conquered her husband's affection and preserved it down to her last day. Never in all his hot youth did he give her occasion for jealousy or wander from her side. It was seldom that the boy-and-girl marriages of the fourteenth century turned out so well.

During 1382 and 1383 Richard, though he only reached the age of seventeen in the latter year, was beginning to develop his personal views on politics. Ever since the eventful day at Smithfield men had seen that he had ceased to be a negligible quantity, and repeatedly during these two years his own voice rings out in debate, and we see that he is no longer the mere mouthpiece of his council. But he cannot yet be said to have started on his career as a reigning monarch : he was still learning such statecraft as he might from his two tutors, Arundel

and Michael de la Pole. He seems from the first to have detested the arrogant and selfish earl, who probably sneered at his petulant outbursts and repressed his high spirits. His confidence was given to De la Pole, whom later chroniclers often call his "favourite," a term most strangely misapplied when given to a veteran official who had worked his way up to a barony by twenty years' faithful service under Edward III.¹

Michael was, if we may use a modern term, a bureaucrat, a man of the middle class who had no sympathy with the factious baronage of which he had become a member. His two main aims were to bring about peace with France, and to restore orderly governance in England. This latter end De la Pole, like all bureaucrats in all ages, wished to achieve by strengthening the royal executive rather than by conferring new powers on parliament. That the administrative machinery of the realm was out of gear had been sufficiently shown by the events of 1381; to set it working aright the only method which seemed hopeful to a fourteenth century statesman of Michael's type was a restoration of the king's personal initiative—a return to the practice of Edward I. The constitutional historians of to-day can see that England was working out a great problem of statecraft, which the greatest of them has called the "Lancastrian experiment". The essential feature of this experiment was the establishment of the control of parliament over the details of the administration of the realm by means of the power of the purse. In the time of Edward III. and Richard II. the Commons exercised an intermittent and sometimes vexatious control over the king and his ministers, but did not relieve them of any of the burdens of responsibility. Neither Lords nor Commons, indeed, dreamed of taking over the conduct of the details of war or of the administration of the realm. They could only support, criticise, or overthrow the ministers of the day. How constantly they kept displacing these officials we have already seen; there had been five chancellors and four treasurers between 1377 and 1383. For the management of either foreign or domestic affairs nothing could have been worse than this constant state of flux.

It is small wonder, therefore, that De la Pole had concluded

¹ His barony was given him in 1366.

CHAP. III. that the only way out of the present state of things was to strengthen the royal prerogative. He had in his charge an active, high-spirited, promising lad, who seemed to be developing all the good qualities of his father, the Black Prince. From such material might be reared a king such as England had not seen since the death of Edward I. Michael dreamed of being the trusted minister of a master who should restore the glories of the early Plantagenets. Nor can we blame him when we consider the abject condition of the realm at the moment, and remember the incapacity which the king's uncles, the baronage, and the Commons had all displayed during the last few years. The lessons which he taught his pupil fell on fruitful ground. Richard was daring, self-confident, even presumptuous, full of a wish to assert himself, and to show his council and his parliament that he was no longer a child. With De la Pole at his side as adviser, he was bound to go far.

It was not till March, 1383, that the young king dismissed the ministers whom parliament had chosen for him, got rid of Arundel, appointed Michael de la Pole his chancellor, and launched out into the experiment of personal government. Before he took that step two new difficulties had appeared. The year 1382 brought up in domestic politics the problem of how to deal with Wycliffe and his teaching, and in foreign politics the question of the war in Flanders and the projected "crusade".

In the preceding volume it has been told how John Wycliffe, late in his middle age, had begun to be a power among English politicians as well as among English theologians. Born about the year 1320, in the north country,¹ he had come up to Oxford, taken orders, and proceeded to his doctorate in the faculty of theology. He stayed up as a teacher, and for some time held the post of master of Balliol College. For many years he was only known as an acute lecturer in the popular scholastic theology of the day; so steeped was he in the logical subtleties of the schoolmen that he contracted a dry and technical style, which makes most of his books hard reading to the modern student. Wycliffe reached the age of fifty before he had worked out the theories which were to make his name famous. The most notable of these was the conclusion, not

¹ Near Richmond in Yorkshire.

invented by him, for it had been taught long years before by Marsiglio of Padua and the Ghibelline controversialists, that the Church had no right to interfere in matters of secular government, and should be restricted to the province of doctrine and morals. He added to it the corollary that, when confined to its proper sphere of activity, it would have no need for the greater part of that wealth which the piety of former generations had heaped upon it. On this point Wycliffe was in touch with the general bent of feeling among a large section of the English laity, which was then decidedly anti-clerical. The same feeling which had led to the passing of the Statute of Mortmain is to be detected in Wycliffe's teaching. That the wealth of the Church meant the poverty of the state he would have been the first to concede. But it was not this political, or rather financial, grievance that most provoked him, it was the broad fact that churchmen, instead of devoting themselves to their spiritual duties, were everywhere immersed in secular business. The higher clergy were statesmen, lawyers, diplomatists, administrators, politicians, anything rather than hard-working overseers and guardians of Christ's flock. The monks, with all their enormous landed wealth, Wycliffe conceived to be useless members of society, who did nothing for the nation in return for the enormous revenues which they drew from it. To the friars he had at first felt a more friendly feeling; he had styled St. Francis "a truly evangelical man": but the divergence of their practice from their precepts estranged him: their unscrupulous methods of getting alms, their claptrap sermons, their easy-going methods of dealing with the sins of the laity, with short shrift and swift absolution—the favourite topics of Chaucer and Langland—made them hateful to one who believed in the necessity for a sharp reformation of morals, and for the impression on every man of his personal responsibility for his way of life.

For many years there was little or nothing that could fairly be called doctrinal in Wycliffe's teaching. When he was arraigned before Bishop Courtenay in 1377 the "heretical" theses imputed to him had reference to Church endowments and Church abuses only. The pamphlets which he wrote about that time are mainly on the question of the relation of Church and state, what he called the matter of "dominion". He made a dis-

CHAP.
III.

inction between the various forms of it. "Natural dominion" represented the state of things which would have prevailed had mankind never known the Fall, when all men would have jointly owned all things, and in love served one another without any need for laws. The Fall has rendered this difficult in practical life, and though in theory the righteous may be held to be the joint lords of the world, yet in fact they must be subject, along with the unrighteous, to the laws of the state. There remain, then, to rule the actual life of man "political" and "evangelical" dominion. The former belongs to secular lords and princes, and extends over every sphere of secular life. The latter, conferred by Christ upon the clergy, has reference to souls alone, and carries with it no right to hold temporal property or to exercise coercion over the bodies of men. The Church cannot legitimately call on the state to grant it endowment, or to aid it by force in punishing those who commit purely spiritual offences. But the state may justly interfere to reform the Church whenever it may be necessary: all its property has been entrusted to it under a contract that it shall be used for the good of Christianity. Whenever it becomes clear that its wealth has tempted it into sloth, luxury, or worldliness, it becomes the duty of the state to relieve it of the perilous burden. Wycliffe wished to see the clergy poor and spiritual, not rich and immersed in temporal affairs. He thought that they should live supported by the voluntary tithes and alms of their parishioners.

It is easy to see how these theories could be twisted by extremists in one direction or another. There were enthusiasts who laid stress on the "natural dominion," and dreamed of a day when the just should inherit the earth, in a state of sinless communism, as if the Fall had never taken place. Thus some excuse was given to Wycliffe's enemies for accusing him of communistic tendencies. On the other hand there were plenty of sordid souls who could see in the whole theory nothing but an excellent excuse for a general attack on Church property. They passed over the demand for a reformation of morals, and merely clamoured for a redistribution of lands held by the clergy or the ecclesiastical corporations, with the notion that the taxation of the laity would thereby be lessened, and that there would be plenty of pickings for

themselves. This was the side of the question which appealed to John of Gaunt and his friends. CHAP.
III.

It was not till Richard II. had been for six months on the throne that the English bishops made use of the bulls against Wycliffe which they had received from Rome. But on December 18, 1377, they sent the documents to Oxford, and bade the university arrest the heresiarch. The only result was to show the ascendancy that Wycliffe had secured in his own stronghold. Congregation voted that it was illegal to arrest an English subject on the authority of a papal bull, "since that would be giving the pope lordship and regal power in England". The chancellor, however, asked Wycliffe to stay in Black Hall, and not to go about publicly "lest any one else should arrest him". The confinement was wholly formal and collusive. In February or March, 1378, however, Wycliffe ventured up to London, and answered for himself before the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth. Before any actual trial had commenced Sudbury received a message from the king's mother, warning him not to proceed to pass any sentence upon the accused.¹ Whether the princess, who seldom meddled in politics, acted on her own initiative, or was inspired by some party behind the scenes, is not known. The archbishop, nevertheless, formally opened the trial, with Courtenay of London as his assessor. But it never came to any termination, being broken up by a riotous irruption of citizens of London into Lambeth chapel, which turned the proceedings into a farce or a mob-meeting. Sudbury, who was neither a strong man nor a lover of persecution, adjourned the suit, and never took it up again. Of the eighteen theses extracted from Wycliffe's works which were used for his prosecution on this occasion only one has reference to matters of doctrine. This is the dark saying—part of the doctrine of "dominion"—that "the man living in the state of grace, such as confers grace (*gratia gratificans*), is not only by right but in actual fact possessed of all the gifts of God". Wycliffe, in his defence, justified it from the words "Amen dico vobis super omnia bona constituet eum" in Matthew xxiv. 47. This, if pressed hard enough, as it is in his *De Civili Dominio*, i., 1, would tend

¹ Ne praesumeret aliquid contra ipsum Johannem sententialiter definire (*Chron. Angl.*, p. 183). See also *Eulogium Hist.*, iii., 347.

CHAP.
III.

in the direction of communism. But it seems to have attracted little attention as compared with the storm of indignation roused by his other seventeen theses dealing with Church abuses, disestablishment, and the denial of the temporal power of the papacy.

From April, 1378, the ecclesiastical authorities left Wycliffe unmolested for more than two years. It was in this time that he developed from a mere controversialist, dealing with the relations of Church and state, into a great doctrinal innovator. Only at this late period of his life did he formulate the theories which foreshadowed the views of the sixteenth century reformers—the denial of transubstantiation, the assertion of the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of life, of the comparative unimportance of the sacraments in the way to salvation as compared with consistent godly life, of the dangers of saint-worship and image-worship, the futility of pilgrimages and indulgences, and the doubtful benefit of the existing Church organisation, with its hierarchy of pope, primates, bishops, and inferior clergy. After 1378 he began to arrange, codify, and publish his views on all these questions, in an interminable series of pamphlets, tractates and sermons.

The reformer himself stated that his first doubts as to transubstantiation were raised by the fact that as a logician he found himself unable to conceive of “accidents existing without substance” in the sacrament. He denied that the “accidents” of bread and wine, their shape, colour and taste, all their sensible properties, could persist after their “substance” had been removed by the mystic words which transformed them into the body and blood of Christ. But another cause was largely responsible for his revolt against the accepted theory of the sacrament—he felt a growing horror every time that he reflected on the consequences of that theory. Could it be possible that every morning hundreds of criminous priests were creating and eating the very body of Christ? Was it possible, that when, by some mischance, the host had been carried off and consumed by a dog or a mouse, those animals had partaken of that same body?¹ He found himself instinctively devising reasons to prove that such a ghastly thing could not happen. In such a state of mind he eagerly ran through

¹ *De Eucharistia*, p. II.

the Scriptures and the early fathers, and found his way out of all his difficulties. The fathers, as he discovered, had held "that the communion consists, not in the mere bodily reception, the touching or eating of the consecrated host, but in the feeding of the soul upon that faith which brings forth fruit". From Christ's own words, as expounded by Augustine, he deduced "that Christians receive the Lord's body only spiritually, and that neither an animal nor a man reprobate really partakes of it".¹

This declaration against transubstantiation, which Wycliffe made in 1379 or 1380, and published in the schools of Oxford, formed the turning-point of his career. It transformed him in the eyes of most of his contemporaries from a mere anti-papal controversialist into a heresiarch. It was not long ere many who had once enjoyed his political tirades, and applauded his palpable hits on the pope's tiara or the bishop's mitre, began to shrink from him, and to drop the support which they had hitherto given him. The politicians were frightened away. The classes which he could now influence consisted only of his own academic disciples at Oxford, and a certain body of earnest-minded laity without. It is notable that this body included as yet very few of the nobility or the gentry, on the one hand, or of the peasantry on the other. The former were anti-clerical from political reasons, but had little interest in doctrine. The latter were too ignorant to comprehend Wycliffe's teaching. If ever his theories reached them it was in a distorted shape, vulgarised by fanatics of the type of John Ball,² who had transformed the idea of "natural dominion" into an excuse for a general redistribution of property.

It must have been in 1380, or at the latest early in 1381, that Wycliffe took in hand two enterprises of enormous importance. The first was his scheme for translating the Bible into English; the second his attempt to organise machinery for systematic proselytism, in order to secure that his doctrine should be heard in every corner of England. He accomplished this second end by founding his celebrated band of "poor preachers," who went forth from Oxford³ on missionary

¹ "Haeresis Nona" in the list of Wycliffite errors drawn up in 1381, and given by the continuator of Knighton.

² But Ball had been preaching his doctrines many years before Wycliffe.

³ They were originally *habitantes simul in Oxonia*—perhaps in a hall. See Dr. Rashdall in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, art. Wycliffe, lxiii., 211.

CHAP.
III.

journeys, all clad in a common uniform of long russet gowns. It looked as if Wycliffe, despite his denunciation of the friars, was himself creating a new mendicant order. This, however, was far from his intention; they were to be "seculars," free from any vows; and were bidden not to beg either for themselves or their society. They were not unlettered fanatics, but all, or nearly all, members of the university, who had been fired by Wycliffe's teaching, and hoped to draw all England into his views. They had their faults: some exaggerated their master's teaching in the direction of socialism; others indulged in violent personal abuse against individual prelates and clergy. Many turned out to be weak brethren, who fell away in the day of persecution. But there is no doubt that their mission had considerable influence, though it had not, as some have supposed, any practical effect on the rebellion of 1381; the rebels did not show any symptoms of specifically Wycliffite tendencies, nor does any good contemporary chronicler allege it.¹

Beside sending out the "poor preachers" Wycliffe took in hand, somewhere in the years 1380-81, his great project for translating the whole Bible into the English tongue. He set to work, with the aid of his disciples, to translate the whole canon of the Scriptures, including the Apocrypha, into his native language. The Vulgate, of course, was the text which they had to use, for there was no one then living in England who could have dealt with the Greek and Hebrew originals. This was not absolutely the first attempt to render the Scriptures available for the laity; portions of them had been translated into Anglo-Saxon, and the Psalms at least were accessible in English. There was also, for those who knew French, a rendering of the Bible into that language: but French was now no more than a court language, tending rapidly to die out even in the mouths of the upper classes, and utterly unknown to the burgher. It would appear that Wycliffe himself translated the

¹ Absolutely no credence need be given to the story put about by Walden in *Fasc. Ziz.*, p. 273 (a whole generation after Wycliffe's death), to the effect that John Ball, when confessing before his execution, said that he had been for two years a disciple of Wycliffe, and that he had conspired along with the poor preachers. Contemporary chroniclers would not have missed this. It may be noted, however, that Wycliffe rather extenuates than blames the conduct of the rebels in *De Blasphemia*, pp. 190-202.

four Gospels, and perhaps the whole of the New Testament, while his follower Nicholas Hereford completed the Old Testament and got as far as the third chapter of Baruch in the Apocrypha. When the version was first undertaken, and at what date Wycliffe began to publish such parts as were first completed, is not very easy to determine. On the one hand, his accusers in 1381 say nothing of his translation; on the other, Hereford must have finished his lengthy task on the Old Testament ere he was arrested for heresy in June, 1382. Wycliffe's much smaller contribution must surely have been completed long before his disciple had got so far as Baruch. Yet, as has already been observed, the silence of his accusers concerning it seems to indicate that it had, at least, not been widely circulated, or they would have made it a part of their indictment of his whole life and proceedings.¹

Wycliffe was persistently lecturing on his new doctrine of the Eucharist, and apparently spending his spare time on his translation of the New Testament, when shortly before the outbreak of the peasants' revolt, his enemies recommenced their assault on him. His first assailant was a local enemy, the chancellor of the university, one William Berton, who armed himself with a certificate by twelve doctors of divinity and law, to the effect that the reformer's doctrine of the sacrament was heretical, and then proceeded to the attack. He walked to the Austin Friars (where Wadham College now stands) and found Wycliffe sitting in his high chair and lecturing precisely on the question of transubstantiation. Then he read him a formal inhibition, suspending his right of teaching, and warning him that persistence would lead to excommunication. Wycliffe, it is said, was startled for a moment, but, pulling himself together, replied that neither the chancellor nor his theologians would ever disprove his theses,

¹ A controversy began in 1894 concerning Wycliffe's Bible, started by Abbot Gasquet, who maintained (1) that the book is not Wycliffe's; (2) that the fourteenth century Church had no particular objection to translations of the Bible being made and placed in the hands of the laity. For a reply see Mr. Matthew in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, x. (1895), pp. 91-109. For notes see Dr. Rashdall's article Wycliffe in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, lxiii., 211, and Trevelyan's *Age of Wycliffe*, p. 261. It is impossible to get over the evidence of the continuator of Knighton, writing only two years after Wycliffe's death, and the declaration of Archbishop Arundel that the reformer worked at the book.

CHAP. and that he should make appeal against the inhibition not to
III. the pope or the Bishop of Lincoln, but to King Richard. This calling in of the secular power on a question of doctrine appeared to his assailants a gross aggravation of his offence. So far from obeying Berton's orders to suspend his lectures, the reformer became more active than ever, and issued a tract defining his views on the Eucharist in terms that horrified the orthodox. Much perturbed by this development, his old protector, John of Gaunt, went down to Oxford and roundly bade him keep silence on such topics. The reformer refused to give any such promise, and so forfeited for ever the duke's good will and assistance.

Matters would have come to a head at once but for the outbreak of the peasant revolt, which distracted even academic minds from the question of transubstantiation. It was not till February, 1382, that the struggle began again. The "orthodox," angered at the continual criticism directed against them by Wycliffe and his follower Nicholas Hereford, appealed to the new archbishop, William Courtenay, to resume the attack on the heretic. On May 17 the primate summoned the synod at Blackfriars, generally known as the "council of the earthquake," from the fact that the third day of its proceedings was disturbed by a shock which did much damage in and about London. This assembly, attended by eleven bishops and about three dozen theologians, pronounced ten theses picked from Wycliffe's works to be "heretical" and fourteen more to be "erroneous". The four most important theses had reference to the doctrine of the sacrament; two more had to do with the relations of the papacy and the state; one was concerned with disendowment. On the 30th the archbishop sent down to Oxford a mandate announcing the decision of the synod, and reproving the chancellor Robert Rygge, Berton's successor, for encouraging heretics by his tolerance of their teaching. Rygge, a favourer of Wycliffites if not a Wycliffite himself, showed a surprising audacity by disregarding the primate's letter and naming noted followers of the reformer to preach sermons before the university.

But these were the last days of free-speaking that the Wycliffites were destined to enjoy. The primate, not unnaturally incensed, resolved to bring all his batteries to bear

upon Oxford, and moreover to call in the king and council to his aid. Rygge was summoned to London; when confronted with the wrathful Courtenay he collapsed into abject deference, and appended his signature to the resolution of the council of Blackfriars. He was then taken before the royal council, and there warned that the state would use the secular arm to purify the university, if he dallied any longer with his duty. With manifest reluctance and much procrastination, Rygge carried out the order to expel from the university all open supporters of Wycliffe and any one who dared to defend them, and to search for all heretical books, lecture-notes, and pamphlets, which were to be sent up to the archbishop for inspection and destruction. The heresiarch himself, as it appears, had not been resident in Oxford that term, and was absent at his living of Lutterworth. But his leading adherents were sent down, and some books were seized and forwarded to London. Hereford and Repyngdon, Wycliffe's most noted lieutenants, sought help from John of Gaunt. But he drove them away from his manor of Tottenham with hard words, telling them that "they were no better than men possessed; their views on the sacrament were detestable, and he would have nothing more to do with their cause".¹

Almost immediately afterwards followed the first of the great heresy trials; Hereford and Repyngdon, with a fellow-disciple named John Aston, were cited to appear before a new session of the council of Blackfriars on June 14. Confronted with the theses containing the "heresies" and "errors" of Wycliffe, and summoned to condemn them, they showed no eagerness to be martyrs, and surrounded the gist of their replies with a mass of philosophic and logical technicalities which served, as they were intended, to obscure the meaning. But getting no clear repudiation of Wycliffe from any of the accused, the archbishop declared them convicted of heresy, condemned Aston, and postponed sentence on the other two. Aston was imprisoned, but Hereford and Repyngdon absconded and hid themselves. The primate next compelled Chancellor Rygge to make a further purification of the university, and obtained a royal writ ordering the sheriff of Oxfordshire and the mayor of the city to assist him. All open supporters of Wycliffe

¹ See *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 318.

CHAP.
III.

were compelled to depart, but we shall have to note in the reign of Henry IV. the surviving strength of the Lollards in Oxford ; twenty years after the expulsion of July, 1382, they were still strong in academic circles, and once more offered battle to an Archbishop of Canterbury. But the university was no longer their headquarters, and their work became sporadic, depending on the personal work of individual teachers whose life was migratory.

No attack was made on Wycliffe himself. For the two years which he had yet to live he remained unmolested in his parish of Lutterworth, using his pen with undiminished vigour, and conferring with numerous followers. It would seem that Courtenay and his fellow-inquisitors recognised the fact that the reformer was personally so well liked in many influential quarters that it would be safer to leave him alone. Many men would be loth to see him molested, even though they might disapprove of his theories on the sacrament or the doctrine of grace. Wycliffite views on disendowment, as we shall see, were repeatedly brought up in parliament during the next twenty years ; the men who broached them were not, for the most part, interested in theology, or even keen for the reformation of practical abuses, yet they would have resented a personal attack on the reformer. Archbishop Courtenay was obstinate in his resolves and drastic in his methods ; if he left the old reformer alone for the last two years of his life it must have been because he had good reasons for doing so.

But the immunity granted to Wycliffe was not extended to his disciples. In the autumn of 1382 and for several years following there was a busy hunt after the leading men of the party, and many trials for heresy took place. The main characteristic of these trials is that they led to no martyrdoms. It was only the second generation of Lollards who gave their bodies to be burned rather than subscribe to a confession of heresy. The first leaders were of more malleable stuff : almost without exception they recanted when they saw themselves confronted with the penalties of persistent disobedience. When freed, the weaker men remained terrorised, and for the rest of their days kept their opinions to themselves ; a few returned to orthodoxy and rose to high preferment. The stronger and more sincere men, a large majority, went

back to their old doctrines as soon as they got loose after recantation, and were only more careful for the future to keep out of the grip of the bishops. We must not blame them overmuch: England counted as yet no martyrs of unorthodoxy, whose memory might inspire others to endure to the end for their faith. Moreover the moral weight of the opinion of the whole catholic Church was overwhelming, when it confronted the isolated heretic alone before the episcopal court. Of the men whose names we have already mentioned Aston and Repyngdon were in the primate's hands in the autumn of 1382, and were forced to make a public recantation at Oxford. Repyngdon remained orthodox for the rest of his days, and rose to be Bishop of Lincoln. Aston, the moment that he was free, resumed the life of an itinerant Wycliffite preacher, and wandered up and down the realm for several years, often denounced and hunted, but never caught. Nicholas Hereford fled over seas, with the astounding resolve of appealing to the pope. When he reached Rome he was judged a manifest heretic and spent three years in the castle of St. Angelo. He then escaped, returned to England, and preached Lollardy broadcast. He was caught and forced to recant once in 1386 and again in 1390. After his second capture he seems to have been tamed into submission, accepted a prebend in Hereford cathedral, and survived obscurely into the reign of Henry V. Many similar records of recantation, submission, and relapse might be quoted, if it were profitable to multiply instances.

Meanwhile Wycliffe himself remained unmolested at Lutterworth, busily occupied with his disciples, John Horn and John Purvey, in comparing and collating a vast bulk of literary work; to these two years 1382-83 belong several dozens of his tracts and English sermons, some homiletic, more controversial in their character. He was also revising his New Testament, with the aid of Purvey, who published the second edition after his death. He had a paralytic stroke late in 1382 or early in 1383, which sufficiently explains the sedentary nature of his life. But his brain was busy down to the end, and very shortly before his death he produced a political tract protesting against the disgraceful "crusade" of 1383, as well as an English letter addressed to parliament, in the form of

CHAP. a petition for ecclesiastical reforms.¹ While still engaged in
 III. these controversies, Wycliffe was visited by a second and fatal stroke as he was hearing mass in his own church on December 28, 1383. He never spoke again, and passed away three days later. His body was laid in Lutterworth churchyard, where it remained undisturbed till the disgusting scene of May 14, 1428, when Fleming, Bishop of Lincoln, had his bones exhumed and burned, and cast the ashes into the river Swift which runs hard by. The master had been removed, but the disciples survived, and the movement was still vigorous. How they fared, when not even protected by the ghost of their leader's old popularity, we shall see when we deal with the later years of Richard II. and the annals of the house of Lancaster.

The "Flemish crusade" of 1383, against which Wycliffe protested with his dying breath, was nothing more than a new move in the never-ending strife with France, disguised under the form of a holy war, made at the pope's command for the humbling of the schismatics who adhered to his Avignonese rival. Troubles in Flanders had begun so far back as 1379, but for some time they had been regarded both by French and by English statesmen as a purely local business, as one of the familiar bickerings between Count Louis and the turbulent burghers of his great towns. As long as the count and his rebels fought out their quarrels without calling in foreign aid, their civil war was only important so far as it hindered commerce, and disturbed English and French markets by keeping Flemish money at home. But in 1382 the war had taken a new complexion; the men of Ghent had elected as their *ruwaert* or regent, Philip van Artevelde, son of that famous Jacob van Artevelde who had been the "gossip" of Edward III. and the friend of England. On May 3 the *ruwaert* had defeated the count before the gates of Bruges, and forced him to fly, almost unattended, to Paris. Despairing of winning back his dominions by his own sword, the

¹ The continuator of Knighton has a story that Wycliffe once more visited Oxford before his death, and in November, 1382, was forced to make a profession of faith before certain bishops which amounted to a recantation of his chief views. But the document annexed is no recantation but a careful restatement of all Wycliffe's opinions in his usual style. It seems that the chronicler is in error. If Wycliffe had really recanted, every orthodox writer would have trumpeted out the fact to the world.

exiled count called in his suzerain to his aid. The young King of France embraced the adventure, and the whole feudal levy of his realm was bidden to meet at Arras for an autumn campaign against the Flemings. Philip van Artevelde at once sought the help of England. Within a few days of the count's flight to Paris he had sent ambassadors to Westminster. The envoys not only asked for an army, but for the payment of the fifty-year-old arrears of Edward III.'s debts to Ghent, a sum of no less than £140,000. But the council held (like Canning five centuries later) that the diplomatists of the Low Countries were prone "to offering too little and asking too much". They referred Van Artevelde's proposals to parliament, which was only to meet on October 8. Meanwhile the French king was on the march. CHAP.
III.

The houses on their assembly were met by a new chancellor; the king had taken the great seal from Lord Scrope, and given it to Bishop Braybrooke, Courtenay's successor in the see of London. Scrope had demurred to arrangements suggested by his master for the custody of the lands of the lately deceased Earl of March. When he persisted in his protests, on the grounds of economy, Richard lost his temper and displaced him—one of the first signs of his determination to make his personal influence felt in politics. Braybrooke was a mere stop-gap: the king had already made up his mind to prefer Michael de la Pole to the chancery, but did not do so till the following spring. When the debates began in parliament there was much division of opinion; John of Gaunt and his friends were anxious, as always, that an effort should be made on the side of Castile; there was still an English army in Portugal under Edmund of Cambridge, and they wished to support it. But the number of those who pleaded the cause of the Flemings was far greater than that of those who cared for Lancaster's Spanish claims. The whole mercantile interest in the Commons was in favour of giving aid to Flanders, and the militant party in the Church, the same men who had just been hunting down the followers of Wycliffe, had a scheme of their own in hand. Pope Urban VI. thought that he was not getting from his English supporters all the assistance that was his due. He was now busy with a plan for a general crusade against Clement and his adherents, in which all the

CHAP. "orthodox" nations were to be enlisted. Just before parliament
III. met his bulls arrived in England, proclaiming the crusade, and nominating as his representative and lieutenant for levying the holy war, the bellicose Bishop of Norwich, the victor of North Walsham and the slayer of Litster. Ever since his triumphs of June, 1381, Despenser had looked upon himself as a born general, and the idea of marching at the head of an army against the Clementine schismatics fascinated him.

When, therefore, the debates began, the voice of the churchmen was given along with that of the merchants in favour of aiding the "orthodox" Flemings against their schismatic suzerain. All those who disliked John of Gaunt, and their name was legion, fell in with the scheme; and the Commons, after much discussion, voted the king a tenth and a fifteenth, and suggested, with all deference, that the crusade which the pope had entrusted to the Bishop of Norwich would fit in admirably with a national effort in aid of the Flemings. The money which Despenser was gathering in by voluntary subscription and the sale of indulgences, would lighten the charge on the exchequer. His "crusaders" would swell the number of the army that would sail to join Artevelde. In short, the Commons frankly adopted the cynical view that England would find her profit in turning the religious enthusiasm of the papalist party into a useful political channel. The house of lords, less unfriendly to Lancaster, suggested that while the Flemings must be aided, something might also be done to reinforce the English army in Portugal. But it was the Commons who found the money, and therefore called the tune. They would do nothing on the side of Spain, and were eager to push on the crusade, on the openly avowed plea that it would relieve the financial burden on the exchequer.

But while parliament debated, Charles of France was acting, and Artevelde was ruined. On November 20 the French presented themselves before the gates of Ypres. That great town surrendered without resistance: its defection forced Artevelde to fight at once, for all Flanders was now exposed to the invader and he dreaded more defections. He marched to meet the French, and on the 27th brought them to action at the Mont d'Or, between Courtray and Roosebeke. His host, all spearmen arrayed in dense columns, so densely packed that

they appeared like a single great phalanx, was beset on all sides by the longer but shallower line of the French, crushed into helpless confusion and routed. As many of the vanquished, it is said, perished from being trampled down or suffocated in the tight-locked press, as fell by the edge of the sword. Among those who died in this fashion was the *ruwaert* himself, whose body was found without a wound upon it where the banner of Ghent had stood.

With the death of Artevelde ended all chance of a successful English interference in Flanders. Bruges and most of the smaller towns surrendered, and only Ghent held out, less from hope than from dread of the vast war-indemnity of 300,000 gold francs which the count demanded. But the English government had committed itself to the idea of sending help to Flanders; the preparations had gone so far that they could not be abandoned. The only effect of the news of Roosebeke was to cause the levies to be hurried on, lest Ghent might fall unsuccoured. On December 6 Despenser received the formal approval of parliament for his crusade. On the 21st he and his men took the cross at St. Paul's, with all the ceremonial that had adorned the departure of Richard Cœur de Lion and Edward I. for the holy war. The enormous sum of money collected, and the number of volunteers enlisted, showed clearly enough that a majority of the nation accepted this detestable farce with perfect seriousness. The chroniclers speak with surprise of the vast sums given by women, "all the hidden treasure of the realm seemed to have passed into their hands". The papal bull had empowered Despenser to give "wonderful pardons"; plenary remission for all offences to those who either joined the crusade or paid for an efficient substitute; and the groats and nobles of the superstitious and the conscience-stricken poured unceasingly into the bishop's chest. In that simple way every manslayer or adulterer or swindler got for himself "the reward of the just and the increase of eternal salvation, with all the privileges which are wont to be bestowed on those who set out in defence of the Holy Land".

The most disgraceful part of the business was that the lay politicians who gave the crusade their approval were fully aware that they were misusing the name of Christianity, and disguising an ordinary campaign under the name of a holy war.

CHAP. They were not unwarned. Wycliffe's tract called *Cruciata* is
III. full of the most stinging truths. Christ prayed for his enemies. But the pope bids every man take arms to smite them. Those who settle spiritual disputes by the sword are traitors to Christ, Iscariots, members of Satan, incarnate sophistical devils, when they incite men to slay their fellow Christians in God's name. We know what Christ approves by His words in Scripture: when the pope authorises that which the Gospel condemns, he has become the true Anti-Christ.

Yet when parliament met for a short supplementary session on February 23, 1383, it was not the morality of the expedition that was debated, but simply the details of its finance and its organisation. Some doubted whether it was wise "to commit so great a host to an inexperienced priest". Others disliked the idea of subsidising him with large grants from the exchequer, and wished that he could be made to finance the crusade from his own collecting-boxes. None of the great lords would take service under Despenser, and his lieutenants were all soldiers of fortune, some of them men of tainted reputation. Fearing lest he might be delayed by his critics, the bishop sailed hastily on April 23, and mustered at Calais a considerable army—a motley host of professional mercenaries, ignorant fanatics, young adventurers eager to see the world, and old reprobates anxious to work off their scores of crime. When the host was gathered, the question arose whether it should march into France or attack the parts of Flanders which had submitted to Count Louis. The more honest fanatics doubted the morality of falling upon the Flemish loyalists, who were orthodox Urbanists like themselves. But the bishop laughed such scruples to scorn, and replied that any place that owed the suzerainty of the schismatic King of France was fair game, whatever might be the private opinions of its inhabitants.

The campaign started with several considerable successes: Gravelines, Dunkirk, Cassel, Nieuport, Bourbourg, Furnes, were all taken. But the crusaders sullied their victories by the most horrible cruelty; there was dreadful slaughter of unarmed townsfolk, much rape and arson; an army of professional brigands could not have behaved worse. At last the invaders, aided by a contingent from Ghent, laid siege to the rich town

of Ypres. Before its walls their schemes were wrecked: the place resisted stoutly, and in August the whole feudal levy of France, headed by Charles VI. in person, came up to its relief. Despensers, justly fearing the chances of battle against a host which far outnumbered his own, raised the siege of Ypres, and split up his men in garrisons, to hold the conquered towns of the Flemish shoreland. He himself took refuge within the walls of Gravelines. His garrisons made most feeble defences; many of the crusaders slunk home without fighting; the captains, one after another, drew off their men and retired to Calais or Gravelines. Only at Bourbourg was any serious resistance made, and even there the garrison, after standing one assault, capitulated, upon the terms that they should have a free departure and receive 7,000 gold francs for surrendering their prisoners and magazines. The French finally turned upon Gravelines, in which most of the other garrisons had taken refuge. Anxious to get home before winter, Charles VI. offered to buy the bishop out for 15,000 francs. Despensers ostensibly refused the bargain, but it is certain that 5,000 francs at least were received by his treasurer, with or without his knowledge.¹ A few days later he set fire to Gravelines, and fled by sea. He landed in England on September 29.²

The unending succession of disastrous news which had reached England between the retreat from Ypres on August 11 and the evacuation of Gravelines on September 27 had caused a paroxysm of rage and humiliation. None felt it more keenly than the king himself, who had ridden up from Daventry to London in wild haste,³ swearing that he would sail himself for Flanders before it was too late to save Gravelines. He had ultimately been persuaded to send his uncle of Lancaster in his place, but ere an army of succour could be raised the bishop and his bands were back in England. Parliament met on October 26, and soon resolved itself into a sort of court-martial to try Despensers and his pusillanimous or corrupt lieutenants. The king's views were set forth by his trusted friend De la Pole, whom he had now made chancellor

¹ See the record of the trials of the bishop and other crusaders in the *Rolls of Parliament*, and *Walsingham*, ii., 103.

² For details of this shameful business see *Wron's Crusade of 1383*

³ See *Walsingham*, *l.c.*

CHAP. in the place of Bishop Braybrooke. His first appearance was
III. not unfavourably received ; the Commons voted very liberal grants for the service of the realm, and then passed on to settle accounts with Despenser and his captains. The investigation of their conduct was long and minute. The bishop cleared himself of the charge of personal corruption, but was found guilty of presumption, mismanagement, and breach of his contract with the king. In return for the public money that he received, he had covenanted to maintain 5,000 men in Flanders for a year, but had fled home with the relics of his host only five months after leaving Calais. He was punished by the confiscation of his temporalities for nearly two years, was never trusted again with any state business, and disappeared into obscurity. Of his captains the best known, the old Sir Hugh Calveley, was acquitted ; he had done nothing unworthy of an honourable knight, and had protested against the whole foray into Flanders. But five other condottieri, all noted men of war, Elmham, Trivet, Farringdon, Ferrars and Fitzralph, were fined sums ranging from 3,400 gold francs downward, for having, under various excuses, sold their garrisons, their stores, or their prisoners to the French king.

Thus ended in shame, scandal, and well-deserved punishment the great crusade of 1383. Our only regret is that the parliamentary tacticians who had welcomed the device of a crusade did not share in the disgrace of the bishop and his mercenaries. The nation, it must be confessed, was guilty as a body in the matter, and guilty in spite of the eloquent protests of Wycliffe, who lived just long enough to see his prophecies of divine vengeance on the unholy expedition fulfilled.

CHAPTER IV.

THE KING AND THE LORDS APPELLANT.

DURING the spring of 1384 every circumstance seemed to favour the young king's resolve to take possession of the reins of government, and to work out the scheme of policy which Michael de la Pole had taught him—peace with the external enemies of England, followed by a reorganisation of the internal administration of the realm. Not only the papalist churchmen, but all the adherents of the war party had been much depressed in spirit by the results of the campaign in Flanders. By a separate set of chances it had come about that John of Gaunt's plans for the conquest of Castile, which made him and his friends such consistent advocates of continued war, had been frustrated. King Fernando of Portugal had made peace with Juan of Castile, and sent back his English auxiliaries in the winter of 1382-83, so that it seemed that the duke's dream of wearing a Spanish crown must be abandoned for ever. The general trend of politics was in the direction of peace, and when Lancaster himself negotiated a truce for nine months with France, at the conference of Leulighem on January 26, 1384, it was hoped that a treaty settling all disputed points and a disarmament might follow.

But now a difficulty arose from an unexpected quarter. The truce with Scotland was to run out in February, 1384, but no one doubted that it would be renewed. Yet ere the formal expiration of the truce the Borderers had taken arms, and carried out a raid of unusual magnitude in Northumberland. The Scottish government expressed sorrow for this misdeed, the freak (as it was said) of irresponsible barons of the march,

CHAP.
IV.

CHAP. and offered to renew the truce. But soon after the offence was
IV. repeated ; a great host of retainers of the house of Douglas captured and destroyed Lochmaben Castle early in February, 1384, and shortly afterwards Cumberland was ravaged up to the gates of Carlisle. Despite King Richard's desire for peace, he thought himself bound to resent these inroads. The Scottish government continued to protest its innocence of complicity with the raiders, but its ambassadors were sent back, and John of Gaunt was directed to collect an army at Newcastle for a retaliatory invasion. He crossed the Tweed on April 3, and conducted a leisurely raid through Teviotdale and Lothian as far as the gates of Edinburgh. It was carried out with a humanity rare in border warfare ; the chroniclers note, with some indignation, that Lancaster preserved Melrose and other monasteries, and gave the burghers of Edinburgh three days to clear away their goods, before he entered their city. The Scots retired into the hills and woods, and refused battle, wisely adhering to the advice of "good King Robert's Testament" which forbade them to fight when the enemy was too strong. The lowlands took little harm from the duke's invasion ; he disbanded his host on the 23rd, and went off to sit in a parliament which the king had summoned to meet at Salisbury on the 29th.

This session forms the turning-point of King Richard's reign. It was the first meeting of the estates of the realm at which he openly set himself to face and override his uncles and his other councillors, and to enforce his own policy in parliament. During the winter he had been doing what he could to prepare for the conflict ; he made his old tutor, Sir Simon Burley, warden of Dover Castle, and secured the mayoralty of London for another trusted friend, that same Alderman Nicholas Bramber whom he had knighted at Smithfield after Tyler's death. Bramber, by the royal interference, superseded a certain John of Northampton, a supporter of Lancaster and a suspected Lollard, who headed one of the great city factions, that of the "clothing guilds,"¹ and had been dominating London in a turbulent fashion for the last two years. The king

¹ The guilds who dealt in provisions of any kind, grocers, vintners, fishmongers, butchers, etc., formed the one factor, those concerned with the manufacture (or sale) of clothing, mercers, woolworkers cordwainers, etc., the other,

arrested him and imprisoned him in Corfe Castle, and placed Bramber, head of the "victualling guilds," in his stead. He was rewarded by the new mayor's loyal and unscrupulous support. About the same time we begin to hear much of Richard's partiality for another confidant, the Earl of Oxford. Robert de Vere, unlike the rest of the king's friends, was a very young man, only some two or three years older than his master. They had known each other from childhood, De Vere and Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham, having been brought up in company with the king under the tuition of Sir Simon Burley and the supervision of the Princess of Wales. He is called by every hostile writer the king's favourite, sometimes in the most offensive sense of the word,¹ but it seems strange to apply the term to one who was no upstart, but held an ancient earldom descending in male line from the twelfth century; he was, indeed, the premier earl of England and represented one of the most distinguished, if not the wealthiest, of the old noble families. His ancestor had been one of the guardians of Magna Carta, his grandfather had commanded a wing at Poitiers. Vere was ambitious, overweening, and careless of public opinion, but it is difficult to extract from his recorded acts any justification for the venomous hatred with which he was regarded by the party in the realm which set itself to oppose the king. He does not seem to have possessed Gaveston's biting tongue, or Buckingham's talent for offensive display. The worst thing set down to his account by his enemies is that he divorced his first wife, the daughter of Ingelram de Coucy, Earl of Bedford, in order to marry a landless bride, a certain Bohemian of Queen Anne's train, of the name of Landskrona.

It was a dangerous enterprise that Richard was taking in hand when, with such a small knot of personal supporters and the enfeebled prestige of the royal name, he endeavoured to browbeat or cajole parliament into assenting to the policy which he had learnt from Michael de la Pole. When the houses met at Salisbury on May 5 the chancellor reported that a truce had been secured with France, and that negotiations for a definitive peace might begin, if only it were discovered on what terms it would be honourable to accept it.

¹ As in Walsingham, ii., 148.

CHAP. IV. The king might have treated on his own responsibility, but since the nation had sustained the burden of the war, he thought it right to take his subjects into his counsel. Meanwhile he asked for liberal grants to cover the expenses of the unfortunate Scottish war and the arrears of the "crusade" of 1383.

The subsidy was granted without much difficulty, but it was a hard matter to get an answer out of the houses with regard to the proposed peace with France. They hated to confess that England was beaten, and they disliked giving the king and the chancellor an open mandate to conclude peace, since by so doing they would surrender their cherished right of cavilling at its terms when it should be made. "Put yourselves in the king's place," answered De la Pole, "and say what he should do, having to defend this small realm against so many and great enemies." Very reluctantly the Commons replied that if the Lords preferred peace to war they would not separate themselves from the upper house. The debate in the Lords was equally unsatisfactory. The discussion was rendered shocking to all lovers of decorum by a personal altercation between the king and his old guardian, Arundel, who asserted that all the misfortunes of the realm were due to the king's present ministers. De la Pole and his colleagues having been in office only a few months, it was absurd to blame them for the miserable heritage of a war that dated back to the days of Edward III. The king could not restrain himself when the servants whom he had just placed in power were attacked. Leaping to his feet and pointing his finger at the earl, he shouted: "If you charge it on me, and say it is my fault that England has suffered from bad governance, you are a liar—go to the devil!" Arundel had been provocative, but a king who could not keep his temper was likely to have hard times before him. He was with difficulty soothed by his uncle, John of Gaunt, and finally got grudging assent from the Lords to open negotiations with France.

The houses were still sitting when there occurred a mysterious and discreditable business whose meaning has never yet been cleared up. A certain Irish friar of the Carmelite order, named John Latimer, craved an audience with the king, and delated to him a supposed plot on the part of Lancaster

and certain citizens of London. They were intending, he said, to kidnap and dethrone, if not to murder their master. It seems probable that the friar was a monomaniac, and his story the figment of a disordered brain, as two of the best of the chroniclers definitely assert. But his confident manner and earnestness seem to have convinced the king for the moment. He burst out into a sudden rage, hurled his hood and boots out of the window, like a man distraught, and was about to order his uncle's arrest when the duke himself chanced to come into the room. Richard, looking at him with a suspicious gaze, thrust into his hand the accusation which the friar had drawn up. When John began to make indignant protestations of loyalty, the Irishman cried to the king that he could only save his life by slaying the traitor, while Thomas of Woodstock, Richard's younger uncle, drew his sword and threatened to cut down any one who accused his brother, were it the king himself. At last Richard stilled the tumult, declared himself convinced that the friar was mad, and ordered him into custody in the castle. But that night five or six knights, among whom were the king's half-brother, Sir John Holland, and Lancaster's son-in-law, Sir Thomas Morieux, visited the prisoner in his cell and put him to the torture, to make him declare who had set him on. When he refused to speak they heaped torment upon torment, ending with a horrid device which mortally injured the wretched friar, who died a few days later.

It has been suggested on the one hand that this foul deed was done in the king's interest, to suppress evidence of a plot against Lancaster which had failed; and on the other hand that Latimer was put to death for the duke's benefit, to prevent him bearing further witness. The two views are rendered equally unlikely by the fact that the murderers included confidants both of the king and of his uncle. If they had desired merely to shut the informer's mouth, they would have slain him there and then; while, as a matter of fact, he survived long enough to be twice cross-examined, and confronted with several witnesses to no effect. The dreadful manner of his death caused many men to believe that there must have been something in his revelations. It was bruited about that miracles were wrought at his grave—in which case, of course,

CHAP. IV. Lancaster must have been a traitor! The one certain fact about the business is that for the future the king and his uncle viewed each other with mutual suspicion.

Meanwhile the Scottish war was stopped for a moment. King Robert adhered to the truce of Leulighem, and a formal armistice was proclaimed on July 7, 1384. But as fast as the war died down in one quarter it blazed up in another. Fernando of Portugal, the king who had thrown up the English alliance in 1382, died in the following year. His crown was claimed by Juan of Castile, who had married his daughter Beatrix, a lady whose legitimacy was very doubtful. But the Portuguese refused to be united to Castile, and proclaimed as their king Dom João of Avis, a brother of their late sovereign, concerning whose illegitimacy there could be no doubt at all. He sent ambassadors to London, to seek for English aid, and to promise to support John of Gaunt's claim to the throne of Castile. His emissaries came and were received with enthusiasm by the duke, but with doubt by the king, who saw that, if he allied himself with Portugal, the war with Castile and France must go on, and a general peace would be impossible. A compromise was finally reached; Richard refused to sign any treaty, but allowed the Portuguese envoys to make private levies of English auxiliaries at their own expense, thus keeping it in his power to drop the cause of João, if the French made it a *sine qua non* in the peace negotiations that no support should be given to the foes of their Castilian ally. Some hundreds of English mercenaries sailed for Lisbon, and arrived in time to play a distinguished part in the victory of Aljubarrota on August 14, 1385, which secured the independence of Portugal for two centuries.

The protracted negotiations at Leulighem came to no result. It was in vain that De la Pole had got leave from the Salisbury parliament to make a treaty on any honourable terms, even if they involved doing homage for Calais. The French court had changed its mind, refused to consider a peace as practicable, and would not discuss anything more than a short renewal of the existing truce. It was rumoured in England, and with perfect truth, that extraordinary activity was visible in the French ports, and that money and stores were being accumulated for a projected invasion of Kent in 1385.

Reports to the same effect came from Scotland; whatever King Robert might promise or proclaim, his nobles had agreed to take arms against England at the very moment that the truce should expire, on May 1 of the oncoming year. The peace policy of the king and De la Pole therefore had been foiled for the present: and when parliament met on November 12, 1384, the chancellor's enemies took the opportunity of taunting him with his simplicity in believing that France would ever agree to a fair treaty. Nevertheless the Commons gave the liberal grant of two fifteenths in view of the inevitable renewal of hostilities. During the following winter the main topic of discussion in the realm was the strained relations between the king and his uncle of Lancaster. It came to an open quarrel in February, 1385, when, voted down by the king's friends at the council board, John of Gaunt in violent rage stalked out of the chamber, shouting that neither he nor any of his vassals would aid the king again, unless Richard went out in person to invade France—the policy which the duke had been recommending at the debate. A few days later Lancaster suddenly fled from Westminster by night, with every sign of terror, and shut himself up in his castle of Hertford. He declared that he had been warned of a plot to arrest and impeach him, hatched by the king's friends, the Earls of Oxford, Salisbury, and Nottingham. The story seems improbable, but that the duke believed it is obvious.

His subsequent conduct was not destitute of a certain magnanimity. On the night of February 24, having got together many hundreds of his retainers, he presented himself before the palace of Shene, where the king was lodging. He left the main body of his lances at a distance, and entered the hall in full armour but attended by only a few knights. He then explained to Richard that he had good proof of the existence of a plot against his life, that it was a shame for a king to dabble in such wicked plans, and that he came to make a final appeal to him to banish his worthless advisers and to return to saner and more honourable councils. Richard replied that he knew naught of a plot, and could not believe that it had ever been framed. But if he had committed errors, he was ready to listen to advice and change his policy. Dissatisfied with such assurances, Lancaster asked leave to depart, observing that he could not safely

CHAP.
IV.

remain at court when there were so many about the throne who wished him dead. He rode off in moody discontent, and it looked as if civil war would follow. But Lancaster was loyal at heart, and Richard does not seem to have been implicated in the plot of his adherents, if such a plot ever existed. The princess Joan, the king's mother, set herself to act as mediator, and persuaded the uncle to believe that the nephew had no designs upon his life, and the nephew to forgive the uncle's show of armed force and hard words. Nevertheless, it was rumoured throughout the kingdom that Richard had been detected in a disgraceful conspiracy to make away with his uncle. Archbishop Courtenay took upon himself, in the presence of many witnesses, to censure the king for framing schemes against Lancaster's life. Wildly angry at finding that the primate took for granted the reality of a plot whose existence he had denied on oath, Richard burst out into a storm of abuse, and struck the archbishop in the face. It is even said that he drew his sword upon him, and had to be dragged off by his retainers. This shocking outburst of almost insane rage did Richard as much harm as did his alleged plot against his uncle.

The truce with France ran out, and hostilities began again on May 1, 1385. While the English fleet was looking for the French in the Channel, the admiral Jean de Vienne sailed from Sluys and landed at Leith, with 1,000 lances and a great store of munitions of war destined to equip the Scottish army. King Robert II., a sincere but helpless friend of peace, retired into the highlands and refused to welcome the strangers. But his lords received with enthusiasm the 1,200 suits of armour and the handsome subsidies which were handed over to them, and joined the Frenchmen in a raid upon Northumberland. They left Berwick and Alnwick alone, but harried bare the whole countryside as far as Morpeth. Presently it was rumoured that Lancaster, the Percys, and the Bishop of Durham were marching to meet the invaders. The French knights hoped for a pitched battle, but the Scots refused to fight so far from their base, fell back towards the Tweed, and finally dispersed. The admiral and his lances, disgusted at being cheated out of the fighting that they had expected, were forced to retire to Dunbar. The Scots lords had been wise.

It was no mere Northumbrian levy that was marching against them but a royal host, headed by Richard himself. The whole baronage had been ordered to muster at Newcastle on July 11, but many contingents were tardy, and Richard himself only reached Bishopthorpe, outside York, on the 16th. Here an unhappy incident marred the opening of his first campaign. A brawl arose in camp between some retainers of John Holland, the king's half-brother, and of Sir Richard Stafford, the son and heir of Hugh, Earl of Stafford. One of Holland's squires was slain, whereupon the hot-headed and ruffianly young man sought out Stafford, who knew nothing of the matter, and deliberately ran him through the body without parley or warning. It was a felon's deed, worthy of the butcher who had tortured the Carmelite at Salisbury a year before. The king was beside himself with wrath, and swore to the father of the murdered knight that his half-brother should pay for his crime like any other homicide. Holland took refuge in Beverley minster, but Richard confiscated his lands, deprived him of his offices, and ordered that he should be arrested the moment he quitted the sanctuary. It is said that the news of her son's wild deed and outlawry killed that amiable and well-intentioned lady the Princess of Wales, who died a few weeks later on August 8.

On July 20 the English army reached Durham, and on August 6 it crossed the Tweed. It counted nearly 8,000 men-at-arms, and about 8,000 archers, a great force for the England of the fourteenth century to raise, and better equipped than any host which had ever before entered Scotland. On crossing into hostile soil the king celebrated the opening of his first campaign by creating his uncles, the Earls of Cambridge and Buckingham, Dukes of York and Gloucester. At the same time he bestowed on Michael de la Pole the Earldom of Suffolk, that title having become vacant four years before, by the death of William, the last of the Uffords. The entry into Scotland thus liberally commemorated led to no victories. The enemy refused to fight, though the Scots lords had much difficulty in arguing their ally Jean de Vienne out of his bellicose propensities. Abandoning Edinburgh and all Lothian to the ravager, they slipped aside and made a fierce inroad into Cumberland, hoping thus to draw King Richard home

CHAP. again. The English, meanwhile, went northward, destroying
IV. all the villages and monasteries which Lancaster had left unburnt in the preceding year. Finally Edinburgh itself was given to the flames, along with the abbey and palace of Holyrood.

John of Gaunt was for continuing the advance, and maintained that the Scots would be forced to fight if the intact regions beyond Forth were invaded. He was probably wrong; the Scots knew "King Robert's Testament" too well, and would have abandoned every town rather than give battle to such a great host. The king held a different opinion; he remembered his uncle's old campaigns in France, where he had lost half his armies by want and starvation in a ravaged land. "You and the lords," he said, "may live upon your private stores, but the common soldier perishes by the way. I will not push into these wilds, to destroy my army." He ordered a retreat on Berwick, refusing even to strike across by Eskdale or Liddisdale in order to intercept the Scottish raiders in Cumberland on their return march. The whole expedition was a failure—as indeed it was bound to be in face of the Scotch policy of non-resistance. The only favourable result of the campaign had been that it disgusted Jean de Vienne and the French auxiliaries with service in Scotland. They loathed the country, "a second Prussia for desolation and savagery," and were discontented with their allies, whom they held to be both ungrateful and unchivalrous. Accordingly, the admiral settled the bills which the Scots brought him for entertainment and lodging—he considered them exorbitant—and took his 1,000 lances home to France in the autumn. Their report of the land was so evil that no French expedition went to the north again till that of Pierre de Brézé in 1462.

Meanwhile the French had two other armies on foot. One captured a few outlying towns on the Gironde, but failed to shake the English hold on Bordeaux. The other ravaged the rebellious regions of Flanders up to the very gates of Ghent, and brought the spirits of the burghers so low that in December they made up their minds to submit, finding it useless to look for any real succour from England. Their old and unpopular Count Louis was dead. His son-in-law and successor, Philip of Burgundy, showed himself moderate, and made fair

proffers of amnesty. Seeing this the peace party in Ghent put down the extremists by a bloodless *coup d'état*, and signed on December 18 the treaty of Tournay, which granted them their old rights and charters in return for their submission. This solid gain to France in the Low Countries was balanced by the complete disaster suffered by her Castilian ally, King Juan, who saw his whole army annihilated by the Portuguese at Aljubarrota on August 15. It could not be said that either side had won a decisive success over the other in 1385.

The news of Aljubarrota had arrived, but Ghent had not yet fallen, when Chancellor de la Pole faced parliament on October 20, 1385. It was therefore natural that he should propose to the houses that something should be done to follow up the advantage in Portugal. An army should be sent to aid Dom João, and the command of it should fall, as was natural, to the Duke of Lancaster. The truth was that the king had resolved to get his uncle out of the country, and so rid himself of a long-standing quarrel. The Commons, in response to the chancellor's appeal, made a liberal grant—part was to pay for the expedition to Portugal, part for the succour of Ghent. They granted a fifteenth and a half-fifteenth, on the understanding that the clergy should make a corresponding gift of a tenth and a half-tenth. This last condition gave rise to a sharp quarrel between the Commons and the clerical estate. Archbishop Courtenay raised the objection that if parliament fell into the habit of stating year by year what the clergy was to contribute, this would amount to the taxation of the Church by the laity. "He would rather die," he said, "than suffer the Church of England to become the bond-maiden of parliament." The Commons treated the primate's constitutional scruple as an attempt of the clergy to shirk taxation. Led by certain knights who, if not Lollards themselves, had at least assimilated Wycliffe's views on disendowment, they drew up a petition to the king setting forth the advantage that would accrue to the realm from a confiscation of part or whole of the temporalities of the Church. But the king was anxious to conciliate the clergy at this moment, and tore up the carefully worded memorial of the knights. A few days later convocation voted the tenth and half-tenth, and the whole matter dropped.

CHAP.
IV.

Richard's anxiety to stave off this question arose from the fact that he was now becoming involved in a serious quarrel with the Commons. They were raising once more the old constitutional cry that "the king should live of his own," and protesting against the lavish gifts of crown property made to his uncles of York and Gloucester, his minister Suffolk, and other courtiers of lesser importance. A petition was presented asking him to pledge himself to make no more gifts for a year, and to allow his private accounts to be audited by a commission appointed by parliament. He was also requested to publish the names of all councillors, ministers, and officials whom he intended to employ for the ensuing year. The king made a petulant reply, refused to have his money affairs examined, and declared that he should make or change his officials when and how he pleased. The Commons were highly indignant, and ready to raise further trouble. As if in contempt of them, the king made, almost on the last day of the session, a monstrous and thriftless gift of money and privileges to his friend the Earl of Oxford. He raised him to a rank hitherto unknown in the English peerage, by creating him Marquis of Dublin, giving him, to sustain his new status, palatine rights over the whole of the Irish "Pale," the district round Dublin where the king's writ still ran and some semblance of orderly government was kept up. He was authorised also to conquer all the land that he could from the native Irish, for the augmentation of his fief. To maintain himself it was calculated that he would need 5,000 marks a year, and as the whole revenue of Ireland did not reach such a sum, the balance of it was to be made up out of the English exchequer. The gift was reckless and wholly unjustifiable; Vere had done nothing to merit it. The whole realm was profoundly disgusted at such a waste of public money.

Meanwhile parliament was dismissed, and the king set to work to facilitate the departure of his uncle of Lancaster for Spain. The army which he was allowed to raise amounted to at least 2,000 men-at-arms and 2,000 archers, probably to more. Many magnates took service with the duke, among them the Lords Poynings, Fitzwalter, and Scales, and the king's half-brother, John Holland, who was pardoned for his murder of Stafford on condition that he joined the expedition ;

he married Lancaster's daughter, Elizabeth, shortly before sailing. Full of confidence, John of Gaunt sailed from Plymouth on July 7, 1386, not to return for more than three years.

CHAP.
IV.

If King Richard hoped to obtain a freer hand in dealing with the affairs of his realm when his eldest uncle had taken his departure, he was destined soon to be undeceived. John's place at the head of the party of criticism and opposition was taken by leaders of a far more unscrupulous and selfish disposition, by the Duke of Gloucester and the Earl of Arundel. Lancaster, with all his faults, was loyal to the crown; his secret ambition was to make himself King of Castile, not dictator or regent of England. Thomas of Gloucester was fully as ambitious as his brother, but he had no foreign projects to distract him. As long as Lancaster was at home he had been constrained to take a secondary place; but now that he could pose as chief councillor of the crown—his brother Edmund of York counted for little—his captious and self-seeking nature had full opportunity to display itself. He had a ready helper in Richard of Arundel, who had conceived a bitter hatred for the master who had rejected him as adviser, and the colleague, De la Pole, who had supplanted him. Richard was hasty and ill-advised, but he did not deserve such a sinister fate as to fall into the hands of this malignant pair, whose policy was to wrest every act of folly into a deliberate crime, and to build up popularity for themselves by persistent misrepresentation of their master's doings. The first attacks were made on Richard's confidants, but it was all along evident that the accusations levelled at Suffolk and Oxford were intended to strike the king.

The assault on the "favourites" followed closely on Gloucester's accession to the leadership of the opposition, and synchronised with a dangerous crisis in foreign politics. At the moment of John of Gaunt's departure for Portugal no one suspected that great preparations were being made across the Channel for an invasion of England. But in August it began to be rumoured that ships were being collected in Sluys and other Flemish ports, in such vast numbers that no ordinary Channel-raid could be in contemplation. Another fleet was being gathered by the Constable Clisson in the ports of

CHAP.
IV.

Brittany. Presently it became known that Charles VI. himself had taken down the *Oriflamme* from St. Denis on August 7, and was moving northward by slow stages; an invasion was clearly in the air. The whole scheme was the sudden freak of the young king, and had been determined upon far too late in the season. Preparations should have begun in March instead of August, if anything was to be accomplished. Nothing was ready when October and its storms arrived.

But the English could not know that Charles's armada was never destined to sail. There was something like a panic in London when the extent of the French preparation became known. The king and his ministers, however, took every possible precaution; a fleet was gathered at Sandwich and Dover: the shire-levies of the south were mobilised close to the shores of Sussex and Kent, while those of the midlands, more than 20,000 strong, were cantoned in a circle round London. Having exhausted their provisions, and receiving their pay very irregularly, they became a dreadful burden to the home counties. But the weeks dragged on, and still the enemy came not. When parliament met, on October 1, 1386, the invasion was still hanging fire, and six weeks later came the welcome news that the French army was breaking up, and the fleet in process of being dismantled. The mismanagement at Sluys had been almost incredible; the contingents that arrived early were beginning to desert before those that arrived late had put in their appearance. When the last levies from the south came in, October was far spent, and the Channel was swept by a north-wester that lasted many weeks. At last it fell, but November had come, and when the king's council met to decide on the day of sailing it appeared that there was a majority against sailing at all in such a season. Charles VI. finally went home, shamed and sullen, and nothing came of the expedition save a dreadful deficit in the French treasury.

But when the English parliament met on October 1 it had still seemed possible that any morning might see the French fleet off Dover, or even at the mouth of the Thames. The stress and strain of mind caused by the ever-impending danger seems to have made the houses captious even beyond their wont. When De la Pole advocated a vigorous policy, and

asked for large grants of money, he was received with marked coldness. They replied that four fifteenths could not be raised; such a sum would ruin the realm. The fact was that they had determined not to trust Richard with another penny so long as his present advisers were in power. When, instead of making a grant, they began to harp on grievances, the king, disgusted at delay in such a crisis, retired in dudgeon to his palace at Eltham. A few days after he took the injudicious step of sealing a patent which raised his friend Vere from Marquis of Dublin to "Duke of Ireland," while confirming him in all the exaggerated grants and privileges which had been given him in 1385. A few days later Richard received a message from the Lords and Commons to the effect that no grants would be made nor business transacted till the chancellor, Suffolk, and the treasurer, Skirlaw, Bishop of Bath, were removed from office. The king sent word back "that he would not remove the meanest scullion of his kitchen at their bidding: they had better proceed at once to their proper business, and drop this matter". His irritation seems pardonable, when we remember that at any moment news might come that the French were in the Thames: it was not an appropriate moment for removing ministers and starting impeachments.

Gloucester and his friends, however, displayed a serene indifference to the danger of the realm, and proceeded with their campaign against Suffolk and his master. The houses, under their guidance, voted that they would do nothing till the king returned to Westminster to hear the complaints of his subjects. When Richard invited a deputation of forty members of the Commons to visit him at Eltham, a rumour was set about that he intended to seize them as hostages; some said that they were to be murdered in the king's presence by assassins led by Nicholas Bramber, late mayor of London. Heated debates in both houses took place on receipt of Richard's message. It was at this critical moment that some one—apparently Gloucester himself—formally moved that the records of the deposition of Edward II. should be sent for, and recited to the houses, in order that they might know the exact forms that could be used against a recalcitrant king. Such a proposition sufficiently shows the length

CHAP.
IV.

to which the opposition was prepared to go.¹ Finally, instead of despatching the forty knights and burgesses for whom the king had asked, the houses sent to Eltham a very different embassy—the Duke of Gloucester and Thomas, Bishop of Ely, Arundel's brother. The meeting of Richard and his uncle was stormy: we are told that the duke "would have his nephew remember that he was bound to be present at parliament, and that there was an ancient statute to the effect that if a king deliberately withdrew from parliament, and remained absent forty days, to the vexation and grave expense of his people, the members might go home". Richard replied that this meant rebellion: he would rather seek aid of the King of France, and submit to him, than surrender to traitors. Gloucester poured scorn on the project of an accommodation with France, and asserted that all the troubles of the realm came from his nephew's persistence in retaining corrupt ministers in power. Then, if the story is to be trusted, came words of open treason, the duke added that "if a king cleaves to evil councillors out of mere malignancy and foolish contumacy, there is an ancient statute, acted on not so very many years ago, which permits parliament, with the common consent of the nation, to depose that king, and to set on his throne some other member of the royal house".²

Whatever were the actual words used by Gloucester, it is certain that he alluded to the fate of Edward II., and frightened Richard into surrender. The king came up to London on October 24, took his seat in parliament, and, with rage in his heart but mild words on his lips, consented to dismiss Suffolk and Skirlaw from office. Bishop Arundel was at once substituted as chancellor. No sooner was De la Pole deposed than he was impeached. Not only was he accused of subverting the laws and defying the parliament, but it was asserted that he had been filling his pockets by assigning to himself royal lands and buying up royal debts. But on investigating the

¹ We know of this fact from the document which Richard laid before the judges at Nottingham in the next year. Gloucester seems to be the person designated, though his name is not used. If any one else had taken the step, Knighton would have designated him in his narrative (*Chron.*, ii., 239).

² The "statutes" were, of course, imaginary. By the second the duke probably meant the bill deposing Edward II., which he quoted inaccurately as a general statute giving precedent, not a particular enactment,

details of his impeachment and defence, we find that he made a good defence on every point. On the political articles he could prove that he had acted under the king's orders, and with the consent of the council. As to the accusations of dishonesty, he showed that the only real gift that he had ever received from the crown was a grant of 500 marks a year made when he became an earl, and that was the exact sum with which Edward III. had endowed the first Ufford Earl of Suffolk. An earnest appeal to the Lords was made in behalf of De la Pole by his relative Richard Lord Scrope, himself an ex-chancellor. The earl, he said, was no adventurer, he came of a wealthy and respectable house, had served King Edward and King Richard for thirty years in all honour and repute, had been captain of Calais, admiral, councillor, ambassador, with great credit to himself. Was it credible that he should have become a traitor and a petty embezzler in his old age? He spoke in vain; Gloucester and his friends were inexorable; the earl was found guilty on six out of the seven charges brought against him, sentenced to forfeit all he had ever received from the king, and imprisoned.

The victors then turned upon Richard; he was put once more in tutelage, a council of reform and supervision was to control all his acts for a year, to control his revenue and household, appoint to all offices, and resume all illegal grants of royal property. The commission consisted of Gloucester and Arundel, the king's insignificant uncle Edmund of York, the two archbishops, and six other persons. The king waited till the houses had finished business, and the grants had been made, and then to their consternation warned them, in the speech by which he dismissed them on November 28, that "for nothing done in this parliament would he allow any prejudice to his person or crown, and that he intended that the prerogatives and liberties of his crown should be kept and preserved without detriment".¹ This amounted to a declaration of war. The king next released Suffolk from prison and showed him special honour. He also kept about his person Vere, whom the parliament had directed to depart to Ireland and take up the governance of his unquiet "duchy" without delay. During the spring of 1387 the politics of the realm were in the most

¹ *Rot. Parl.*, iii., 227.

CHAP. abnormal state. The administration was in the hands of the
IV. council of eleven and the ministers whom it had chosen ; but the king, free from all responsibility of government, was busily going up and down the midlands, trying to organise a party for himself and to prepare for civil war. The moment was not propitious ; the nation was satisfied with the new administration, which had reaped the benefit of the ignominious failure of the French invasion, and won some credit by certain naval successes obtained in the Channel by the Earl of Arundel.

Blind to all this, Richard continued his preparations ; at Shrewsbury and again at Nottingham he assembled the greater part of the judges of England, headed by the chief justices, Tressilian and Belknap, and Cary, the chief baron, and laid before them a string of constitutional questions. Whether overawed by the king, as they afterwards pleaded, or influenced by the inveterate respect for precedent which sways the legal mind, the judges on August 25 gave it as their opinion : (1) that the appointment of the council of eleven in the last November was against the ancient royal prerogative rights of the king ; (2) that the Lords and Commons had no right to diverge from the programme of business laid before them by the king and to discuss other matters without his leave ; (3) that the king alone could dismiss ministers, and that parliament could not impeach them without his leave ; (4) that the person who had caused the statute relating to the deposition of Edward II. to be recited in parliament was a traitor ; (5) that the sentence passed on Suffolk had been erroneous and was revocable. They further expressed their opinion that the individuals responsible for all the late attacks on the royal prerogative were guilty of high treason, and lay at the king's mercy for their lives and property.

Armed with this document, which he kept secret till the moment for its use should arrive, Richard waited for a propitious moment to strike. His most faithful adherents warned him that public opinion was unfavourable, and a private meeting of sheriffs held at Nottingham assured him that they could not hope to raise a man under his banner, if he designed to attack the council. Finding that he could not count on the militia, the king took the desperate step of commissioning Vere to make private levies of mercenary troops. But many

of the professional soldiers whom the duke sounded declared that they would not take the risk, and Richard had not sufficient funds to equip even the small number of those who were ready to join him. Meanwhile his plans were not kept sufficiently secret ; and, warned by some friend at court, Gloucester came to know of his nephew's designs. He too made ready for the struggle, leaguings with himself his old ally Arundel, the Earl of Warwick, and two magnates who were new figures in politics, Henry Earl of Derby, the heir of John of Gaunt, and Thomas Mowbray Earl of Nottingham. The latter was an unstable young man who had once been among the king's confidants, but had been offended and estranged by the favour shown to his rival Vere. He was now about twenty-two years of age, and had lately married Arundel's sister. Derby was still younger, having only reached his twenty-first birthday. Since his father's departure for Portugal he represented the house of Lancaster and all its territorial influence ; his ability and his disposition were equally a matter of speculation at the moment. But it was clearly not to his interest that the king, his father's enemy, should make himself despotic, or, on the other hand, that Gloucester should be able to pose as the sole champion of parliamentary liberties.

On November 10, King Richard returned to London, with Suffolk, Vere, Bramber, Burley, Tressilian, the Archbishop of York, and other friends in his train, but not accompanied by any considerable body of armed men. It is probable that he intended to execute a *coup d'état* on the 19th, the day on which the council of eleven, who had been nominated for a year, came to the formal end of their delegated authority. By refusing to allow of their reappointment he would gain a notable tactical advantage. But he had no sooner reached London than he heard that Gloucester and Arundel were already gathering armed bands, the former in Essex, the latter at his castle of Reigate in Surrey. On the morning of the 11th Richard despatched Percy Earl of Northumberland to arrest Arundel ; but the earl—whose heart was not in the business—returned to report that he had found such a formidable body of retainers collected at Reigate that he could do nothing. His mere appearance, however, had precipitated matters : that same night Arundel rode off with his lances, crossed the

CHAP. Thames, and joined Gloucester and Warwick at Bishopswood
IV. near Waltham. Many other magnates of their party came in that same day.

On November 12 the malcontents despatched to the king three members of the council of eleven—the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lords Cobham and Devereux—with a defiant message to the effect that they had taken arms to deliver him from his five traitorous advisers, Vere, Suffolk, the Archbishop of York, Chief Justice Tressilian and Sir Nicholas Bramber, “who were estranging him from his true friends”. Richard bade the mayor of London raise the city militia, but was informed that the citizens would not arm: they considered Gloucester and his friends the champions of the liberties of the realm. The Earl of Northumberland and Lord Basset used much the same language, and told their master that “they had no intention of getting their heads broken for the sake of the Duke of Ireland”.¹ Meanwhile, on the 14th, Gloucester, Arundel, and Warwick issued at Waltham a manifesto, in which they “appealed” of treason the five friends of the king whom they had already designated as traitors; from this moment they are generally styled the “lords appellant”. Three days more passed, while the king was vainly attempting to organise resistance, and the army of Gloucester was swelling to a formidable host. At last Richard was forced to recognise that his effort was fruitless: he bade his friends fly and save themselves. Vere rode off in disguise to Cheshire, the one region where the king had friends who were ready to take arms in his behalf. Of the other “traitors” Suffolk absconded to Calais,² the archbishop retired to Yorkshire, and Bramber and Tressilian hid themselves in London. When his adherents had vanished, Richard invited the appellants to enter London, declared them his loyal subjects, and promised that Suffolk, Vere and the other fugitives should be tried in parliament. All this was done merely to gain time; it was his hope that Vere would succeed in raising an army, and deliver him from his captors.

¹ Knighton, ii., 244.

² He had many adventures ere he got completely away. At Calais he was recognised, though disguised as a poultry-dealer; his own brother, Edmund de la Pole, refused to receive him, and he was arrested. But the king contrived him a second escape, and he reached Paris in safety.

The Duke of Ireland did his best : he raised a force at Chester, where the gentry and yeomen of the Palatinate took pride in regarding themselves as the king's immediate vassals, and were ready to defend their local privileges. Some of the mercenaries whom he had enlisted in the preceding summer came to his aid. At last he could muster 4,000 men, headed by Sir Thomas Molyneux, constable of Chester, Sir Ralph Vernon, and Sir Ralph Ratcliffe. He resolved not to march by Watling Street, the direct way to London, but to take a circuit more to the west, so as to elude the appellants, who would be looking for him on the more obvious line of march. Avoiding main roads, he hastened southward through Staffordshire and Worcestershire, mounted up on to Cotswold, and moved by Stow-on-the-Wold towards the passages of the Upper Thames. On the first news that he was in arms Gloucester began to collect all his friends : the country was indignant that the king should have given the signal for civil war, and many magnates who had hitherto remained neutral joined the lords appellant. It is from this moment that we find the young Earls of Derby and Nottingham joining in all their councils and signing their manifestoes. Richard meanwhile shut himself up in the Tower, and sent secret messages in every direction in the vain hope of securing allies. It was even reported that he wrote to the King of France, offering to cede him Calais, Brest, and Cherbourg, and to do homage for Guienne, in return for assistance in the domestic troubles of England.

Uncertain as to the exact route which Vere would take, the five appellants made their first muster on Newmarket Heath, but they soon had to march westward and southward in haste, to intercept his progress. On December 12, when they lay at Huntingdon, they had a long and heated debate—Gloucester and Arundel proposing to dethrone the king, since he had dared to raise civil war. When confessing, two years later, that he had gone so far in treason, Duke Thomas alleged that he had designed to depose his nephew for a few days only, and then to restore him under strict constitutional checks. But it is fairly certain that if Richard had been once stripped of his crown he would have been murdered, or, at best, imprisoned for life.¹ Gloucester could not induce all his colleagues to

¹ Confession of Gloucester, in *Rot. Parl.*, iii., 376-79; see *infra*, p. 135.

CHAP. fall in with the plan: the king must have a successor, and
IV. (unless his contemporaries misjudged him) the duke would gladly have accepted the position. But Henry of Derby was there to plead the superior claims of his absent father, and the Lancaster interest was strong. After a long discussion, Derby and Nottingham refused to acquiesce in any scheme for Gloucester's benefit, and finally it was resolved that Richard should be put under strict tutelage, while his adherents were to be dealt with in the most stringent fashion: the precedent of Edward II. was in every mind and mouth, and the fate of the two Despensers was reserved for Suffolk and Vere.

Meanwhile, hurrying towards Oxford, the lords got tidings of the whereabouts of the royalist army. Derby, whose troops formed the vanguard, was just in time to seize and barricade the bridges of the Upper Thames, Newbridge by Eynsham, and Radcot, before Vere came down from Cotswold. On December 20, a day of impenetrable river-fog in that region, the duke appeared in front of Radcot bridge with his host, only to find it impassable and strongly held. He came to a stand, and while he was hesitating, Derby and Gloucester, who had been warned of his approach, appeared on his flank with their divisions. For a moment Vere thought of giving battle, but his men showed no stomach for the fight, and began to disperse while the enemy was still at some distance. Throwing up the game, the unfortunate young man cast aside his helm and gauntlets, leapt from his war horse, mounted a lighter steed, and galloped off along the foggy water-meadows looking for a ford. He evaded his pursuers, swam the river, got safely away, and ultimately reached France. His deserted followers made off; there was little bloodshed, though Molyneux, the constable of Chester, was murdered in cold blood, after surrender, by Sir Thomas Mortimer. Some scores of the Cheshiremen are said to have been drowned as they tried to swim the river, but only two were slain. The numerous captives were stripped and allowed to go home. In Vere's baggage were found several recent letters from the king, urging him to hasten his march on London.

The triumphant appellants could now deal with Richard at their leisure. They marched back to London, were admitted into the city by the mayor, Nicholas Exton, and encamped

around the Tower. The king had no option save to surrender ; he yielded to every demand made, consented to leave his fortress and remove to Westminster, and there gave his assent to all the proceedings of the victors. They rehearsed to him two proscription lists, one of persons to be arrested and tried, the other of persons merely to be banished from court. Besides the five "traitors" the first list included John Lord Beauchamp of Holt, the seneschal of the household ; Sir Simon Burley, constable of Dover Castle ; the three old condottieri, Trivet, Elmham, and Dagworth, and a dozen or more of the king's confidential clerks and military retainers. These were all cast into prison, along with Nicholas Bramber, the only one of the original five who had been caught. The persons to be banished were the Lords Zouch, Beaumont, Burnell, Lovel, and Camoys, together with three ladies and a number of knights and squires.

On February 3, 1388, the parliament met. The house of commons had been shamelessly packed with the dependants of Gloucester, even beyond the evil custom of the time. From the upper house the king's adherents had been weeded out by the late edict of banishment. The "merciless parliament" (*parliamentum sine misericordia*), as this assembly was rightly called, sat for no less than 122 days, the greater part of which were spent in carrying out a series of judicial murders, for the trials of Richard's unhappy followers deserve no better name. The appellants began by arresting, as they sat on the bench, the six judges who had signed the Nottingham "opinion," and sent them to the Tower. When the Chancellor Arundel had finished his introductory sermon, Gloucester strode forward and launched out into a long harangue. He proclaimed himself the most loyal subject of the king, and denied that he had ever designed to depose his nephew. He added that he and his associates had refrained from proceeding to extremes out of respect for the glorious memories of Edward III. and the Black Prince, in hope that the king might yet be reformed, though there was good precedent for dealing with him as his great-grandfather, Edward II., had been treated.¹

¹ These details are from the accusation made against Gloucester in 1397, which states that the duke "deinz vostre royale palais de Westminster, à dit Parlement de l'an unzisme, disoit qu'ils avoient cause souffissant pur vous

CHAP. IV. After this truculent preface the whole of the five lords appellant came forward and repeated their original "appeal" of the king's friends. A vast document was produced, which took two hours to read, accusing them in thirty-seven sections of abusing Richard's tender age, inducing him to waste the treasures of the realm, estranging him from his loyal councillors and kinsfolk, prompting him to murder Gloucester and Arundel and massacre the Commons, and urging him to betray Calais to the French. The five accused failed to make an appearance to defend themselves, and the appellants demanded that they should be declared guilty.

Next morning the king put in an objection that neither the common law of England nor the civil law justified such a method of procedure, as all his legal advisers had assured him. But this plea had no effect: the lords voted that for dealing with such high matters of state and such powerful criminals parliament was the only proper tribunal; England had never been subject to the civil law, and parliament was the highest court under the common law. They therefore held the "appeal" to have been well and duly set forth according to the proper procedure. A few days later the lords passed sentence on Suffolk, Vere, and Tressilian, sentencing them to be drawn and quartered, while all their lands and goods were forfeited. Archbishop Neville's life was spared, in consideration of his clerical status, but his goods were confiscated and his see was taken from him.¹ There remained Sir Nicholas Bramber, the only "traitor" of the original five who was in custody. Besides the charges in which he was implicated along with the rest, three special crimes were laid to his account: he had volunteered to murder the forty deputies of the Commons in October, 1386, had made a list of 8,000 Londoners who were to be executed, and had proposed to the king to change the name of London to Troynovant (clearly after reading Geoffrey of Monmouth!), and wished to

déposer, mes que al reverence de tres noble Roi votre aiëul, et vostre tres noble père, disoit qu'en espoir de votre meilloure governance ils vous voudrent souffrir continuer votre regalité" (*Rot. Parl.*, iii., 376).

¹The parliament induced the pope to translate him to "schismatic" St. Andrews, which he could not approach, since England and Scotland were at war. He retired to Flanders, and died there serving a petty parish cure.

be made duke instead of mayor of the city. The preposterous nature of these accusations did not prevent his being condemned, and beheaded on Tower Hill on February 20, 1388. Yet, his was not the first head to fall : while his trial was proceeding Chief Justice Tressilian was caught. He had hidden himself for three months in London, but going forth in rash curiosity to watch the proceedings at Westminster, was recognised and arrested, though he had disguised himself in a false beard and a beggar's tattered gown. Since he was already a condemned person, he was hurried off to instant execution at Tyburn.

If Gloucester and his friends had stayed their hands at this point, and had been contented to visit the king's less prominent adherents with exile or imprisonment, they would have comparatively little to answer for at the bar of history. But they now proceeded to try and execute a number of persons whose only crime was that they had been busy and faithful servants of the king. On May 4 Thomas Usk, under-sheriff of Middlesex, and John Blake, one of the king's clerks, were hung. On the 12th Lord Beauchamp, Sir Simon Burley, Sir James Berners, and Sir John Salisbury were impeached. Much interest was made to save Burley, the old companion-in-arms of the Black Prince and the tutor of Richard's boyhood. The Duke of York and the Earl of Derby attempted to beg him off, but Gloucester was inexorable. The queen herself visited him, and prayed on her knees for the life of her husband's oldest friend. Gloucester brutally replied, "*Ma mie, priez pour vous et pour votre mari ; il le vaut mieux,*" and sent her away. He even went to the king and told him that unless Burley died, he should be treated as Edward II. had been. Sir Simon was beheaded on the 5th, Lord Beauchamp, Berners, and Salisbury on the 11th. The six judges who had signed the "opinions" of Nottingham were condemned to death, but their sentence was commuted to exile for life to Ireland. The king's confessor, the Bishop of Chichester, was deposed from his see and translated to Kilmore in the wilds of Brefny.

To the victors the spoils. The archbishopric of York was given to Arundel's brother, the Bishop of Ely, the chancellor ; Arundel himself became high admiral ; Gloucester appropriated

CHAP.
IV.

the lordship of Holderness, and the castle, forest, and manor of Oakham—all taken from Vere. Moreover he intimated to parliament that he and his colleagues had spent much toil and money in delivering the kingdom; whereupon the Commons voted that £20,000 should be paid to the five lords appellant for their good services. This they accepted, though they had been declaiming all through the session about the impoverished state of the treasury, and the pressing need for economy. Parliament was dissolved on June 4, 1388. Nothing formal had been done to change the constitution; the king was left, as he had been in his earlier years, under the tutelage of his council, and with ministers chosen for him by parliament. He had been terrorised by the execution or exile of all the friends whom he had gathered about his person during the last five years. But no permanent check had been put upon his prerogative; the victors thought that they had broken his spirit, and that he would be upon his good behaviour for the rest of his life. They were mistaken: Richard's mercurial temper rose again; he dissembled for a while, but he never forgot the moment when his partisans went to the block, and when the precedent of Edward II. was paraded before his eyes. He bided his time.

CHAPTER V.

THE KING'S REVENGE.

THE first period of the reign of Richard II. is one of the most interesting epochs in English history. The great rebellion of 1381, the attack on the Wycliffites, the constitutional struggle between the king and the lords appellant, are episodes of first-rate importance in the development of medieval England. All the more striking, therefore, is the dulness of the ten years that follow. The chroniclers felt it, and the stream of narrative which has flowed freely since the death of Edward III. shrinks into a mere trickle of disconnected and often trivial anecdotes. No new question was raised ; no new historical figure appears upon the scene. Nearly all the leading characters of the first period of Richard's reign survive through this dreary time, to witness the startling third act which was to complete the tragedy of his life. John of Gaunt and Thomas of Woodstock, Warwick, and Arundel with his brother bishop Thomas, Henry of Derby and Thomas of Nottingham, the two old chancellors Wykeham and Scrope, though many of them men of mature age, were all destined to live out the years of peace, and to see chaos come again in 1397. Only the king's two chosen confidants, Suffolk and Oxford, disappear in the interim. Both died in exile, before their master again raised his head, De la Pole in 1389, Vere in 1392. Had they survived, the *coup d'état* of 1397 would probably have taken a somewhat different shape.

The domination of the lords appellant lasted only a single year: but the time was long enough to enable the nation to appreciate their essential selfishness, and to gauge the hollowness of their patriotism. The monstrous vote of £20,000 which

CHAP.
V.

CHAP. they awarded themselves as a testimonial for their services,
V. must have sufficed by itself to undeceive many of their adherents. The nature of their policy was displayed at the second parliament summoned under their auspices, which met at Cambridge in September, 1388. Its legislation took shape in sumptuary laws, and stringent reinforcement of the Statute of Labourers. No man was to be permitted to move from hundred to hundred without a licence; employers found giving more than the statutory wages to their workmen were again threatened with grievous fines; no boy who had once been set to agricultural labour was ever to be allowed to change his avocation, and become apprentice to a tradesman or mechanic. It was ordained that no labourer, servant, nor poor person should be permitted to possess arms of any description save a bow and arrows. A special clause threatened with condign punishment any one who should be so hardy as to put about malicious reports concerning the magnates of the realm.

Foreign affairs during this year were quiet on the side of France; Charles VI., instead of renewing his plans for an invasion of England, had shown his usual inconsequent spirit by launching out into a war with the Duke of Guelders, which profited his uncle of Burgundy but not himself. Along the Channel the French were kept quiet by a civil war in Brittany between the duke and the Constable Clisson, who had raised once more the claims of the house of Blois to the duchy. The Earl of Arundel was able to keep the seas undisturbed, and made notable captures of French merchantmen.

On the northern frontier, however, there was much trouble this year. The Scots regarded the lords appellant as their benefactors, for distracting the attention of England from the Border, and thought the time propitious for a foray on the largest scale. While their main army, under the Earl of Fife, passed round the head of Solway, swept by Carlisle, and ravaged all Cumberland, a second picked force of 3,000 mounted men and 2,000 foot, under the Earls of Douglas, Mar, and Moray, crossed the Tweed and devastated all the land as far as the gates of Newcastle-on-Tyne. The Earl of Northumberland shut himself up in Alnwick, leaving his sons Henry, the famous Hotspur, and Ralph to take the field. The elder brother gave

CHAP.
V.

battle to the Scots ere half his men were collected, was beaten outside Newcastle, and lost his banner. He swore that he would recover it, and when more levies had come up, hurried after the Scots, who were retreating by the inland road. Having 600 men-at-arms and 8,000 archers, he now outnumbered them, and was anxious to force on a second fight at all costs. On the third night, August 15, 1388, he found them encamped by Otterbourne, between two morasses, in a strong position which they had roughly ditched and palisaded. The sun was already set, but Hotspur feared that the enemy would abscond before morning, and set upon them by the light of the moon. Archery was of no avail in the dark, and the two hosts met in a wild hand-to-hand combat, in which no man could see how matters were going a few yards away from his own fighting ground. Douglas was beaten down and mortally wounded, but his men, unaware of their general's fall, held their own and finally repulsed the English, whose leaders, both Henry and his brother Ralph with twenty-one other knights, were taken prisoners and led off to Edinburgh. They paid heavy ransoms; the king, on the petition of parliament, contributed £3,000 for that of Hotspur. Next spring the Scots renewed their raids into Northumberland, and were very inadequately resisted by the Earl of Nottingham, to whom the custody of the march had been consigned.¹

But there was at last in the new year 1389 some prospect of a truce both with Scotland and with France. Before the campaigning season began Gloucester opened negotiations with the French court; now that he was in power he saw the advantage of making peace, though he had so frequently railed against it while he was in opposition. Charles VI., much harassed by the heavy debts which he had contracted for the abortive invasion of 1387 and the Guelders war of 1388, was also peacefully inclined. He offered a three years' truce, provided that his allies, the Scots and Castilians, were allowed to participate in it. As to Castile there was no difficulty, for reasons which will shortly be explained. But the English government wished to insert, in any agreement with the Scots, the old claim to suzerainty over the northern

¹ Walsingham, ii., 180.

CHAP. kingdom which the Edwards had been wont to assert. The
V. negotiations came to a deadlock on this point.

In May, 1389, King Richard made an unexpected move of self-assertion. Entering the privy council one day, he asked his uncle, Gloucester, what might be his age. Much surprised, the duke answered that his royal nephew was twenty-three years old. In that case, the king replied, he must now be of full age, and entitled to take his proper share in the choosing of his ministers and the administration of his realm. He then requested the treasurer, Bishop Gilbert, and the chancellor, Bishop Arundel, to resign their offices. If Richard had followed up these declarations by appointing partisans of his own to the vacant posts, and recalling the exiles, he would have brought about civil war in a week, and would have ceased to be king before he was a month older. But, to the intense disappointment of the lords appellant, he offered the great seal to Bishop Wykeham, and the treasurer's keys to Bishop Brantingham; both were old officials of Edward III., who had repeatedly held the posts now offered them by the request and authority of parliament; moreover, they were as much outside the circle of the king's friends as they were unconnected with the lords appellant. No reasonable objection could be made to them, nor to the appointments of less importance which were made in renewing the council. If Gloucester and his friends had taken arms to overthrow the king at that moment, they would have stamped themselves as mere shameless self-seekers. They hesitated, hoping, perhaps, that Richard would before long commit some act of folly, and outrage the feelings of the nation; from their knowledge of his character they thought nothing more likely. But the king had learnt his lesson; he assumed a pose of ostentatious moderation, showed himself for the moment the model of constitutional monarchs, and was full of soft words and decorous professions. Meanwhile he had bethought him of a most effective mode of muzzling Gloucester; he would recall to England John of Gaunt, who would never suffer himself to be guided or overridden by his impetuous younger brother. Deprived of the position of first prince of the blood, Thomas of Woodstock would sink into comparative insignificance. In August, 1389, it became known that Lan-

caster was about to return home at the special request of his royal nephew. CHAP.
V.

To explain how John of Gaunt was once more free to resume a position in English politics we must turn back three years, to the moment of his sailing for Spain in July, 1386. His success in the peninsula had been greater than might have been expected. Landing at Corunna he raised his banner in Galicia, where there still existed a faction that had a friendly memory of his father-in-law, Pedro the Cruel. Santiago and several other places opened their gates to him, and he obtained a foothold in the realm that he claimed as his own. Juan of Trastamara showed an unexpected weakness: his army had been wrecked at Aljubarrota in the previous year, his partisans were discouraged, and, instead of marching into Galicia, he began to negotiate. He offered to marry his son and heir, Don Enrique, to Lancaster's daughter by Constance of Castile, on whom her father's and mother's claims must ultimately devolve. The duke would listen to no such proposals for the moment. He intended to conquer Castile and crown himself king at Burgos, by the aid of his own army and the forces of his ally, João of Portugal. Next spring the English and Portuguese troops met at Braganza for the invasion of Leon. The alliance was formally sealed, before the campaign began, by the nuptials of the Portuguese monarch and Lancaster's elder daughter Philippa, the child, be it noted, not of Constance of Castile but of John's first wife, Blanche of Lancaster. The hand of Katharine, the heiress to the claims of Pedro the Cruel, was still left free.

The campaign of 1387 turned out to be one of those half-successes which forebode ultimate failure. In Galicia the duke's lieutenants reduced Orense, Vigo, Pontevedra, and many other places, so that the whole province was practically in his hands. But the main attack on Castile was utterly fruitless; the Spaniards refused battle, retired before the invaders, devastating the land, and contented themselves with garrisoning great towns like Astorga, Valladolid, and Zamora. Juan of Trastamara, indeed, copied the tactics of Charles V. of France, and had the same success as his model. There arose a dreadful pestilence in the Anglo-Portuguese camp, due to the alternations of starvation and excess to which the army was

CHAP. V. exposed in its progress across the plains of Leon. Half Lancaster's knights were dead by the autumn, among them his son-in-law, Sir Thomas Morieux, and the Lords Poynings, Fitzwalter and Scales. The King of Portugal fell dangerously ill, and the allied army retired to Almeida in a state of utter exhaustion.¹ Lancaster had lost no battle; he had conquered Galicia, and yet he saw that his long-cherished dream of ascending the Castilian throne must be abandoned. The realm, save Galicia, was loyal to the house of Trastamara, and it was hopeless to think of conquering the country at the head of the wrecks of the English contingent and the small Portuguese army, which never liked going far from its own border. John's hopes had been grounded on the theory that Castile was full of discontented nobles who would join his banner the moment that he appeared. Not a man of importance had done so; the mere fact that the hated banner of Portugal waved over the pretender's host was enough to condemn him in the eyes of all good Spaniards; the semi-Portuguese Galicians were the only exception.

When, therefore, the King of Castile renewed, in the winter of 1387-88 the negotiations which he had first broached in the autumn of 1386, he found the temper of the duke completely changed. With much sorrow of heart John recognised that he could never wear the Castilian crown himself; meanwhile it was offered to his daughter, and Don Juan added inducements of no mean importance to clinch the bargain. The King of Portugal showed himself willing to concur, at the price of a permanent peace and some cessions on the side of Estremadura and Algarve. Accordingly in the spring of 1388 the war of the Castilian succession came to an end; the marriage of the two children, Katharine of Lancaster and Enrique of Castile, was settled, and John and his wife Constance made over to them all their claims. A magnificent indemnity was made for this surrender; the duke was given a lump sum of 600,000 gold francs, which was not only voted by the Castilian cortes, but actually paid, in three instalments. In addition he received a pension of 40,000 francs for the term of his natural life, while the duchess obtained the towns of Guadalajara,

¹ For the only good account of this campaign see Armitage-Smith's *John of Gaunt*, pp. 320-30.

Olmedo, and Medina-del-Campo and their revenues. After settling everything, and supervising his daughter's marriage at Palencia in September, 1388, John of Gaunt was free to return to England, loaded with the gold of Spain. CHAP.
V.

Of all this Richard II. was aware when he sprang his mine against the lords appellant in May, 1389. Lancaster announced his intention of returning in August, but did not actually appear till November. But the mere rumour that he was coming seems to have sufficed to damp any treasonable scheme of Gloucester's friends. The king received him, with manifestations of unconcealed delight, as his deliverer and best friend. With his arrival commenced the period of seven quiet years to which men were wont to look back after 1397 as a sort of golden age. The truces with France, Castile, and Scotland had all been settled before his advent; the stupid claim to mention the English suzerainty over Scotland in the protocols being once dropped, no further trouble had been experienced in bringing the matter to a conclusion. A solid three years' truce was concluded with all the three enemies of England on August 15.

Thus, when parliament met on January 7, 1390, the prospects of the realm appeared to be more hopeful than at any date since the king's accession. Richard's attempt to seize autocratic power had been frustrated, but so had the attempt of the lords appellant to establish an oligarchy. England was being governed in a thoroughly constitutional manner, and, owing to the long truce just secured, there was every prospect that taxation would be light for some time to come. Men were already talking of the possibility of concluding a definitive peace both with France and with Scotland. The general feeling was one of cheerfulness and security; the chancellor, Wykeham, opened the proceedings with the declaration that the king was of greater age and discretion than he had been in his tender youth, and was now disposed to govern in all justice, peace, and right. He was anxious to please his subjects, and besought them to have no hesitation in petitioning him for redress of every possible grievance that might occur to them. A few days later the chancellor and treasurer, together with the members of the council, formally resigned their offices, and begged that if they had

CHAP.
V.

done any wrong they might be arraigned and indicted by the parliament, now that they were private persons. On the next day both the Lords and the Commons replied that they had no reproaches to make to the king's servants; indeed they considered that they had acquitted themselves very wisely and honourably of their office. Thereupon the king bade them take up their duties again; the only change that he made was that John of Gaunt and Gloucester were added to the number of the council; it was natural that they should be there, and the elder brother would suffice to keep the younger in order. By this clever manœuvre Richard put himself right with the nation; his ministers had been formally approved by parliament, and the two houses could not for the future carp at his nominees as the mere creatures of royal favour.

Much legislation took place in this session: and several bills of importance were passed: one was directed against the practice of trying before the council offences that should have come before the ordinary law courts; another was levelled at the pernicious practice of livery and maintenance. But the most important of all dealt with the ancient abuse of papal "provisions". The statute of 1351 against those who obtained from Rome the grant or reservation of a benefice or an office, to the detriment of the rightful patron, was re-enacted. Stringent penalties were imposed on those violating the act: the commoner was made liable to the punishment for treason, prelates might be exiled or lose their temporalities, lay lords were exposed to forfeiture. Yet brave as was the language of the statute, the abuse was not extirpated: whenever the English government was weak and wished to court the pope, the provisor reappeared, unabashed as ever. At the end of the session the king testified to his extreme satisfaction with the conduct of his uncle of Lancaster, by creating him for life Duke of Guienne, with all the privileges which the Black Prince had held when Edward III. invested him with that enormous fief. Only the supreme suzerainty was reserved to the king: every right of local regality was transferred to the duke, who was allowed to appoint all his own officials, to coin money, and to draw the whole revenue of Guienne into his own exchequer. John preferred for the most part to administer this great dominion by deputy, and was only resident for ten months in the

duchy during the nine years of life that yet remained to him. CHAP. V.
 The grant was too great for any subject: all that can be pleaded in its favour is that it was beyond seas, and did not create another *imperium in imperio*, like the duchy of Lancaster, on this side of the Channel.

For the next three years England may, almost without hyperbole, be said to have enjoyed the proverbial happiness of the land which has no history. The chroniclers are reduced to eking out their meagre annual survey with plagues of gnats, portentous storms of thunder and lightning, narratives of tournaments, and miracles wrought by the relics of obscure saints.¹ Parliament met with regularity to vote moderate grants—a fifteenth and a half, and a tenth and a half in 1391, a tenth and a fifteenth in 1392, nothing in 1393.² The usual subsidy on wool and merchandise was running all the time in virtue of a three years' grant, made in 1390 and renewed for the same period in 1393. Of the ministers, Wykeham resigned the chancellorship, pleading old age and fatigue, in September, 1391; Bishop Arundel, despite his close connexion with the lords appellant was then replaced in the office. It is evident that the king was striving to humour those of his old enemies whom he did not regard as wholly beyond the bounds of conciliation. The treasurer had already resigned his post in March, 1391, and had been followed by John Waltham, Bishop of Salisbury, who held office for four years. The legislation of the time was mainly in the direction of reinforcing old acts—the provisions of the Statute of Mortmain were tightened in 1391, and in 1393 the statute of *Præmunire* imposed forfeiture on all those who brought into the realm bulls or other papal rescripts without the king's leave. It is notable that in 1391 the king was enlightened enough to reject a bill draughted by the Commons to prevent villeins from sending their children to school, "to advance them by means of clergy," and so withdraw them from the power of their lords.

In 1392 there arose a bitter quarrel between the king and

¹ For the gnats see Knighton, ii., 311, and Higden, ix., 215; for the storms, *Annales Ricardi II.*, p. 158, and Walsingham, ii., 197; for tournaments, *ibid.*, p. 195, *Annales*, p. 165, and Higden, ix., 235; and miracles, *Annales*, p. 159.

² It met in November-December, 1390; in November-December, 1391; in January-February, 1393, at Winchester; and in January-March, 1394.

CHAP.
V.

council and the Londoners. The citizens had been requested to make an advance of £1,000 to the exchequer by way of loan; they refused, whereupon a Lombard merchant provided the sum. This so much irritated them that a mob fell on the unfortunate Italian, beat him and left him for dead. For this contumelious proceeding they were put out of the king's grace; their mayor was deposed, and a warden, one Sir Edward Dalingridge, was set over the city for some months. It was finally only by the mediation of their old foe, John of Gaunt, that the citizens were given back their old civic constitution. They were compelled to pay £10,000 for their pardon, and even then, as we are told, many lords of the council murmured at the king's lenity to these "greedy, arrogant, and turbulent folks, these supporters of Lollardy and contemners of God and the ancient traditions".¹

A far more important affair was a sedition which arose in the next year in Cheshire. On a rumour that John of Gaunt was scheming to take the county out of the royal demesne and deprive it of its palatine privileges—perhaps to get it added to his own duchy of Lancaster—the Cheshire men rose in arms. It would seem that the Earl of Arundel, the most bitter of the lords appellant, thought the opportunity a good one for attacking the duke, whom he regarded as the king's champion and protector. He gathered an armed force at his castle of Holt on the Welsh march, and was suspected of an intention to join the insurrection; some said that he had been its secret organiser, and that the Duke of Gloucester was at his back. When the council commissioned Lancaster to raise an army and suppress the sedition, Arundel did not dare to oppose him openly, but behaved in such a suspicious fashion that the duke came to the conclusion that he was guilty. Having dispersed the rebels, and dealt also with some local disturbers of the peace in Yorkshire, Lancaster made an unfavourable report on the earl to the king and council. They met in the subsequent parliament of January, 1394, and at once fell to high words. Arundel took the initiative, and made a preposterous indictment of Lancaster under six heads, charging him with usurping royal powers and oppressing both the king and the nobility. He was wont to use such "rough

¹ See Walsingham, ii., 208-10, and Knighton, ii., 319.

and bitter words" in the council that no one else dared speak ; he had defrauded the king of a great heritage by grasping the duchy of Aquitaine ; he had squandered the public money on his own enterprises ; finally, it was shocking that he should habitually walk arm-in-arm with his nephew, as if they were equals, and that Richard should be seen wearing the Lancaster badge of the collar of SS, as if he were his uncle's retainer. The Lords and Commons refused to be shocked ; the king himself rose to defend his uncle, and Arundel was not only forced to apologise but dismissed from the council. The only result of his move had been to knit closer the alliance between Richard and John, and to make the latter a bitter enemy for life of his accuser. This was to be one of the most important facts at the bottom of the coming *coup d'état* of 1397. Hating Arundel, Lancaster came to hate Arundel's friends.¹

CHAP.
V.

Far more notable than any of these political troubles is the constant activity of the Lollards. Despite all the legislation of 1382,² and the activity of the bishops in seizing preachers and missionaries, the sect maintained itself or even multiplied its numbers. The leaders, when put on trial, nearly always consented to make recantation, but almost as invariably they relapsed when granted their liberty, and were only more cautious in the future to avoid arrest. The spectacle of the Lollard doing penance in a white sheet, with cross and candle in his hands, was familiar at many a market cross ;³ but those who were in the secret could still find a conventicle for Bible-reading and exhortation in many quiet corners which the arch-deacon's officials could not smell out. From 1389 onward we learn that the Lollard leaders practised presbyterian ordination ; their priests laid hands on laymen of approved character, and gave them the power of consecrating the sacrament and administering absolution. Thus they were no longer dependent on regularly ordained clerks for the performance of their worship. When, a little later on, during the time of Henry IV.,

¹ See Walsingham, ii., 214 ; *Annales R. II.*, pp. 159-62 ; Higden, ix., 230-40 ; *Rot. Parl.*, iii., 309-23. The majority of writers do not hint that Gloucester was supporting Arundel, and some hotly deny any treasonable intent on the earl's part.

² Walsingham, ii., 188.

³ See cases in Knighton, ii., 313.

CHAP. V. it is said that "laymen ordained laymen," we may no doubt conclude that the consecrators belonged to the first generation of irregularly ordained ministers. Meanwhile the activity of the sect was shown by the secret circulation of pamphlets and tracts, and by the constant appearance on church doors and other public places of "articles" setting forth the iniquities of the papacy and the worldliness of the clergy. Meanwhile lay Lollards of high estate were still considered too big fish for the bishop's net. While itinerant preachers and tradesmen were continually being arrested, knights like Sir Lewis Clifford, Sir John Clanvowe, and Sir Richard Stury not only frequented the court, but were entrusted with the conduct of the most important public business.¹

The year 1394 saw a satisfactory renewal of the truce with France. A formal peace could not yet be arrived at; at the last negotiations in 1392 at Amiens the plenipotentiaries had reached a deadlock on two points; the French wished to make the dismantling of the fortifications of Calais a *sine qua non*; the English had harped on the unpaid balance of the ransom of John of France, due ever since the peace of Calais. Now, at a renewed conference at Leulighem in April-May, 1394, each side showed signs of giving way, a prolongation of the truce for no less than four years was secured, and the final pacification was only put off for one twelvemonth more. The French were far less disposed to make difficulties than a few years before, mainly owing to the disaster that had fallen on the realm by the commencement of the madness of Charles VI. From 1392 onward he was liable to constant attacks of insanity, which gradually grew so regular that during the summer months he was generally in confinement, though in the winter he was himself again. There was an end of all his youthful schemes of conquest and military glory, and peace seemed the only desirable thing to his councillors.

This same year saw the deaths of the three greatest ladies in the land, and each death had a certain political importance. On March 24 died Constance of Castile, Duchess of Lancaster. After a decent interval of something over a year, the duke shocked public opinion by marrying his mistress, Katharine Swynford, who had already borne him four children—those

¹ Clanvowe even went as ambassador to France in 1389.

Beauforts who were to play such a prominent part in the annals of the next century. Not long after the duchess, early in July, as it appears, died Mary Bohun, the wife of Henry of Bolingbroke, the duke's only legitimate son. She was the heiress who had brought him the half of the Hereford estates, and had made him a great landed proprietor even while his father lived. By her he was the father of four sons and three daughters, though he had not yet attained his thirtieth year: the male line of Lancaster seemed in no danger of extinction. Lastly, on June 7 died Anne of Bohemia, Queen of England, the king's much-loved consort and inseparable companion, "great in deeds of charity, patroness of the poor and the Church, a lover of faith and justice". Her one misfortune was that she bore her husband no children; had he possessed a son and heir his political position would have been much safer, and no dangerous succession question could have arisen. The king was almost beside himself with grief; at her funeral his shattered nerves betrayed him into a strange outburst. His old enemy, Arundel, came indecently late for the ceremony, and, ere it was over, insolently asked the king for leave to depart on urgent private business.¹ Richard, wild with rage at the interruption, snatched a wand from one of the vergers and struck the earl across the face, so that his blood gushed out upon the floor of the abbey. He then ordered him to be arrested, but released him after a week's imprisonment in the Tower. It was noted that the king caused the palace of Sheen, where his wife had died, to be pulled down, and avoided for a long time any place where he and she had been wont to dwell together.

For the present the bereaved husband sought distraction from his grief in an expedition to Ireland, which had been delayed by the queen's illness. It was more than two hundred years since any English king had crossed over to visit his great western lordship, and Richard deserves credit for remembering his duties to the island, which his predecessors seem to have regarded mainly as a suitable place for the honourable exile

¹ The fullest account of this strange incident is in the Interpolation to *Annales Ricardi II.*, p. 424. Arundel was absent at the bearing forth of the queen's body, only appeared in the abbey, and a little later said that he wished to depart "ob certas causas quae eum urgebant"

CHAP. of inconvenient relatives or unruly barons. It was certainly
V. high time that something should be done to restore the royal authority in Ireland. Ever since the invasion of Edward Bruce in 1316-18, which swept away so many old baronial families, and absolutely exterminated the Englishry of numerous districts, the state of the island had been growing steadily worse. In the thirteenth century there had still been some chance that the land might be Anglicised and the natives assimilated by the settlers; but in the fourteenth century it appeared more likely that all traces of Strongbow's conquest would disappear, and that the old Celtic anarchy might supervene. The boundary of the English Pale was steadily shrinking; the earldom of Ulster had entirely disappeared, so that Dundalk, and not Downpatrick or Carrickfergus, was the northern limit of occupation; the MacMurroughs and O'Byrnes of the Wicklow mountains had descended into the plain and cut short the limits of Kilkenny and Carlow; there was little "hinterland" left behind Cork, Waterford, and Wexford. The central block of royal domain now included little more than the districts of Dublin, Oriel and Kildare, with parts of Meath. The other obedient regions were mere patches, cut off from the Pale by intervening tribes who lived in a perpetual state of revolt. But this was not the worst; the most threatening symptom was the relapse of the outlying English settlers into Irish customs and Irish independence. The great house of De Burgh in Connaught, the vanguard of the invasion, fell away in the fourteenth century, changed their name to MacWilliam, intermarried with the O'Briens and O'Rourkes, and became tribal sovereigns instead of English barons. The Fitzgeralds of Desmond were hardly less disloyal, and had frequently been in arms against the crown in the time of Edward III. The famous statute of Kilkenny of 1367, which endeavoured to make the adoption of the Irish dress, language, or customs by the Englishry a penal offence, had completely failed to effect its object. If the English colony was to be saved, and the native chiefs to be forced back into homage to their suzerain, no ordinary lord-lieutenant, and no mere trifling contingent of mercenary troops, such as had been sent over often enough, would suffice. This Richard saw, and came in person with a great army, which is said to

have amounted to 4,000 lances. He took with him his uncle of Gloucester, probably because he feared to leave him in England, and the Earls of March, Nottingham and Rutland.¹ The insignificant Duke of York was named regent on the king's departure upon September 29, 1394, while Lancaster went over seas to take up in person the governance of his great duchy of Guienne.

Richard landed at Waterford, and was joined soon after his arrival by the Earl of Ormond, the one great Irish baron who was sincerely loyal, and all the forces of the Pale. From thence he marched overland to Dublin, meeting no open resistance, though the wild Irish occasionally vexed his camp by nightly alarms and irruptions. It seems that the greater chiefs had resolved not to provoke him; they proceeded to offer an empty submission, reserving their right to fall back into rebellion till he should have returned to England with his great army. At any rate, Neill O'Neill of Ulster, Art MacMurrough, titular King of Leinster and lord of the Wicklow hills, O'Brien of Thomond, O'Connor of Offaly,² and many minor heads of septs came into Dublin and did homage; seventy-five "kings" are said to have been feasted at once in the castle. With them certain Anglo-Irish of doubtful loyalty, the Powers from the Decies, Thomas Burke from Connaught and the Fitzgeralds of Desmond made their submission. The king took considerable pains to impress the Celtic chiefs by his splendour, and to win their favour by his liberality and benevolence. He even induced O'Connor, O'Brien, O'Neill, and MacMurrough to adopt English garments and manners for a few weeks—much to their discomfort—and knighted them in St. Patrick's with the chivalrous ceremonials hitherto unknown in Ireland.³ MacMurrough was induced to cede his fastnesses in Wicklow in return for richer and less defensible lands in the plain, but repented of his bargain, and was thrown into prison, from which he was only released after giving hostages for his loyalty.

¹ Edward of Rutland, the son of York, had been made an earl in 1390.

² Hardly recognisable in the *Annales Ricardi II.*, p. 173, as Onelon, Makmourrh, and Abron, and associated there with Ocelli (O'Kelly), Araly (Analy?) and other mishandled names (see *Annals of the Four Masters*, iv., 723-27).

³ A most amusing account of all this may be found in Froissart, iv., 39-45. It was given to the chronicler by Henry Cristall, the knight to whom Richard entrusted the training of the four kings in civilised manners.

CHAP.
V

The general effect, however, of Richard's stay in Ireland was excellent, and he won golden opinions by publishing at Easter, 1395, a general amnesty for all past treasons both of the Irish and of the Englishry, and by taking measures to reform the bench of judges and to purify the civil administration of the realm. His letters frankly own that the corrupt and harsh governance of his officials had been the cause of many of the late rebellions, and display a statesmanlike desire to enforce justice between the natives and the settlers. In May, after he had spent more than six months in Ireland, Richard sailed home, leaving his cousin and designated heir, Roger Earl of March, as lord-lieutenant. The cause of his return was a recrudescence of Lollardy in England, which raised such alarm that Bishops Arundel and Braybrooke crossed the sea, to beg him to present himself in London without delay. Not only had the disciples of Wycliffe been defying the bishops by their open preaching and their repeated publication of manifestoes—one very long document had been posted on the door of St. Paul's—but they had dared once more to make appeals to parliament, and had found supporters in that body.

The Parliament had met in January during the king's absence, under the presidency of the Duke of York. A group of Lollard knights, of whom Sir Thomas Latimer and Sir Richard Stury were the best known, presented to the Commons a bill drawn up under twelve heads or "conclusions". It urged the instant reformation of the Church from its many abuses—political bishops, incontinent clerks, false crusades, indulgences given for money, image worship, pilgrimages, ceremonies of exorcism and benediction which had sunk into mere formulæ of sorcery, and so forth. The "conclusions" wander off from these practical demands to set forth Wycliffite doctrine, and deny transubstantiation in the sacrament, the validity of vows of celibacy, the benefit of adoration of saints and relics, and the profit of masses for the souls of the departed. The parliament seems to have ignored the petition; but as it did nothing in the way of rebuking or punishing the petitioners, and showed itself once more not averse to the demand for disendowment, which accompanied the whole agitation, the clergy were seriously alarmed, and sent for the king. Richard now, as in 1384, did what they desired, by signifying his disapproval of the Wycliffite

movement and exacting an oath from Sir Richard Stury, the actual introducer of the bill, that he should never again set forth such opinions, "Whereupon the rest drew in their horns and retired into obscurity". Richard nevertheless retained in his service, and even in his household, notorious favourers of Lollardy, such as Sir Lewis Clifford and Sir John Montagu, who not long after succeeded to the earldom of Salisbury.

Public attention was soon distracted from this Lollard agitation by the news that the much-desired peace with France was at last approaching. On his return from Ireland the king found letters from Charles VI. awaiting him, which proposed a renewal of the abortive conferences of Leulighem and Amiens. Richard eagerly accepted the proposal for a new conference, and named his plenipotentiaries on July 8. From that date onwards negotiations were in progress, which soon developed into a scheme for a marriage-alliance between the two powers. Isabella, the eldest daughter of Charles VI., was only seven years of age and Richard was now twenty-nine, but he agreed to take the child as his wife. However politically desirable such a match might be it had one serious inconvenience. The king needed a son to make his throne secure; as long as his distant relative Roger of March was his designated successor, the crown was not beyond the grasp of other and more ambitious relatives. By wedding a mere child Richard postponed indefinitely the hope of an heir. But he judged peace worth even this risk. As to the terms a curious device was adopted: instead of raising once more the thorny questions of homage to be done for Calais, or the exact boundary of the duchy of Aquitaine, the two powers took the *status quo* as the base of negotiation, and simply prorogued it for thirty years, leaving to the next generation the task of settling all disputed points. Each king was to keep what he now possessed, and the truce, which had still over two years to run, was to be continued for twenty-eight more from 1398, the date of its expiry. The Princess Isabella was to receive no jointure in lands, but a magnificent dowry in cash.

Interminable negotiations as to matters of detail occupied the autumn of 1395 and the spring of 1396. Public opinion in England showed itself on the whole favourable to the marriage and the peace. Only Gloucester kept up an impotent

CHAP. monologue of objections and sneers. He openly said that the
V. terms of 1360 were the only base on which an acceptable peace could be concluded; that the king was dishonouring his ancestors and the crown of England, and that the present arrangement would not endure for two years. His opposition was only partially soothed by the promise of an earldom for his son, and of a handsome grant from the exchequer for himself, pledges which were never redeemed. John of Gaunt, on the other hand, showed himself very well disposed towards the treaty, a disposition which we may probably connect with the fact that the king had propitiated him by acquiescing in his recent marriage with Katharine Swynford, had given the lady her full precedence as a duchess, and had promised his favour to the duke's four children by her, the Beauforts.

All preliminary negotiations having been completed, the Kings of France and England met in October, 1396, on the march of Calais between Guisnes and Ardres. On the 26th, Charles handed over to Richard his little seven-year-old daughter, "the creature whom I love most of anything in this world save my son, the dauphin, and my queen," as he observed when consigning her to her chosen husband. After much sumptuous ceremonial, the meeting broke up, and Richard was married to Isabella at Calais on November 4, and brought her back to England a few days later. He had now reached, as it seemed, a position of safety and power such as no one could have ventured to foresee after the unhappy events of 1387-88. It was the reward of eight years of self-restraint and careful humouring of the nation, the clergy, and the parliament. He had at last freed himself from the burden of the French war, whose constant drain upon the exchequer had been the originating cause of all the financial quarrels between the crown and the opposition, since the rupture of the treaty of Calais. He had bought the support of his uncle of Lancaster, who was now his loyal helper instead of his jealous critic. The agreement between them reached its closest point when, in the parliament of February, 1397, the king announced that he had granted letters patent legitimising all the duke's children by Katharine Swynford, and had created the eldest of them, John Beaufort, Earl of Somerset. It is doubtful how far this

can have given satisfaction to Lancaster's one lawful son and heir, Henry, Earl of Derby. CHAP.
V.

That prince had been much absent from the realm of late, occupied first by a crusade in Lithuania to help the Teutonic knights, and afterwards by a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. When at home he seemed for the time to be dominated by his father, and had given up his old alliance with Gloucester and Arundel. Of the other lords appellant, Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham, also appeared to be high in the king's favour; he had quarrelled with the Earl of Warwick about their respective claims to the lordship of the Welsh lands of Gower, and on receiving a favourable award on that question seemed to have been completely bought over from the ranks of the opposition; he had served as ambassador to France in 1396, and had been made captain of Calais. In the oncoming troubles he appears as the king's trusted accomplice, the executor of his most unscrupulous designs. Gloucester, Arundel, and Warwick, on the other hand, were in grave disfavour, though Richard had carefully refrained from alarming them by any open attack, since his outburst against Arundel at Queen Anne's funeral. Gloucester still sat in the council, had shared in the Irish expedition, and had accompanied his nephew to the marriage festivities at Guisnes. His factious opposition within the council chamber and reckless language without it, drew down repeated rebukes from his brother of Lancaster, but his freaks had passed unpunished. Arundel, too, can hardly have suspected that any plan for his discomfiture was brewing, for his brother, the chancellor, had just been translated to Canterbury in September, 1396, on the death of Courtenay. That the parliamentary party which had backed Gloucester and Arundel was weakened in spirit, if not extinct, seemed to be proved by an incident which took place during the session of January-February, 1397.

The Commons had shown themselves reasonably liberal in their grants to the crown, but had persisted in their ancient custom of criticism of the royal administration. They had sent up to the Lords a bill complaining: (1) that sheriffs were continued in office for more than a year; (2) that the peace on the Scottish march was ill kept; (3) that the abuse of livery and maintenance was as prevalent as ever; and (4) that the

CHAP. king's household was unduly numerous and expensive—the
V. oldest and most inevitable clause in every fourteenth century petition. Richard was specially accused of keeping at court too many bishops and ladies—the ladies being, apparently, the enormous retinue of the young queen. An attack on the expenses of the royal household had always been sure to excite Richard's indignation in his unregenerate days, ten years back ; but no one expected that he would flare up into a furious outburst on the topic in 1397. But while giving a courteous answer on the other points, the king declared himself mortally offended and insulted by the criticism passed on his domestic economy, and charged Lancaster to demand from the Commons the name of the member who had drawn up the fourth clause. This was a direct attack upon freedom of debate, and we should have expected that the house would have resented it : but it acted in the tamest fashion and informed the king, by the mouth of Speaker Bushy, that Thomas Haxey was author of the clause. Haxey was neither a knight nor a burgess, but a canon of Southwell, and apparently one of those proctors of the clergy who still occasionally appeared in the Commons. On this presumptuous clerk, betrayed by those in whose company he had been sitting, Richard expended all his wrath. He induced the Lords to vote that any one who stirred up the lower house to attacks on the ancient royal prerogative ought to be held a traitor, and then had him tried in parliament. Haxey was adjudged to have committed treason and condemned to death. It is true that the king then recognised his status as an ordained person, allowed Archbishop Arundel to beg him off, and released him on May 27. But this display of unreasonable rancour augured ill for his future policy, and the cowardice of the Commons encouraged him to set out once more on the path of self-assertion.

It seems hard to believe that Richard's constitutional rule during the last nine years had been nothing more than a deliberate preparation for a snatch at autocracy in 1397 ; but the evidence points this way. Despite of his mercurial temperament, and the sharp changes from elation to depression, from rashness to tame submission, which had marked his career in 1385-88, Richard was not incapable of a steady purpose or a deep scheme of revenge. That he had a good memory for

the doings of friend and foe we know from many small pieces of evidence. He cherished an exact recollection of acts of disrespect and casual words of contempt that had vexed him in the days of the Merciless Parliament, and repaid them ten years after. He never forgot his dead friends. The lords appellant would have done well to ponder over a certain incident in September, 1395, when Richard caused the body of Vere to be brought over from Louvain, where he had died three years before, and buried with great state in the priory of Colne. Before the coffin was placed in the tomb, the king had it opened, looked for a long time on the embalmed body of the duke, and clasped his dead hand, on whose finger, it is said, he slipped a ring of price, as if in token of some pledge between them. The pledge was not one of sentimental remembrance of the past, but of revenge for the future. That revenge had to be deferred till Richard thought his position perfectly secure, till the French war was over, till parliament had shown itself reduced to base subservience, till Lancaster, Nottingham, and many magnates more were firmly leagued to the royal cause, and Gloucester, Arundel, and Warwick were practically isolated. The story that Richard was scared into action by new plots of the three lords in 1397 cannot be sustained, though the king himself caused it to be bruited abroad, and some of his admirers inserted it in chronicles.¹ When producing his formal indictments of the three lords the king did not set forth evidence of any new treason, but harked back to the old doings of 1387-88.

The actual moment which Richard chose for executing his long-deferred revenge was July 8, 1397. Gloucester had just been making himself more than usually objectionable at the council board, over the question of the restoration of Brest and Cherbourg to their rightful owners, the Duke of Brittany and the King of Navarre. These two places had been put into the hands of the English in return for value received and for military purposes. The war was over, and when the Breton duke and the Navarrese king produced the money required to buy back their fortresses, it was impossible to deny them their own. Gloucester, however, took the opportunity of reproaching his nephew with cowardice and indolence, and then with-

¹ As for example did Froissart and the Monk of St. Denis.

CHAP. drew to his castle of Pleshey in Essex, under a diplomatic plea
V. of illness, which was destined to serve Richard's purpose only too well. A few days later he was invited along with Arundel, Warwick, and many other magnates to a state banquet at Westminster. He sent a letter of excuse, setting forth his ill health; Arundel, who seems to have suspected some treachery, also failed to appear. Warwick, however, came to the feast, and was arrested, to his intense surprise, for the king had addressed him in friendly terms only a day before. Arundel unwisely surrendered himself next day, on the persuasion of his brother the archbishop, who had been cozened by the king into believing that no serious accusation against the earl was on hand; it will be remembered that he had once before been arrested, and released after a mere week's detention in 1395. On the following night, July 10, the king himself secretly collected an armed band, headed by his brother John Holland,¹ Earl of Huntingdon; his nephew, Thomas Holland, Earl of Kent;² his cousin, Edward, Earl of Rutland (the son of York), and his confidant of the movement, the earl marshal, Nottingham. He made a night march into Essex, came unexpectedly to Pleshey Castle, and there arrested his uncle of Gloucester, who was not brought to London but shipped off from the Thames-mouth to Calais, of which Nottingham was the captain. In a similar fashion Arundel was relegated to the Isle of Wight. To allay the natural suspicion that he was about to revenge himself on all the traitors of 1387, Richard proclaimed that the arrests were caused by the discovery of a new plot, and had nothing to do with old treasons.

That this plea was false soon became evident; the king removed with his court to Nottingham, and there on August 5 issued summons for a parliament, before which the three prisoners were to be tried, not for any new offences but for their doings of nine years back. By a piece of spiteful humour Richard had determined that the appellants should be themselves "appealed". He had organised a party of eight friends of his own, who undertook to discharge this function—his

¹ He had been made Earl of Huntingdon on his return from Lancaster's Spanish expedition.

² The elder Thomas Holland had died that spring, this is his son, a very young man.

brother Huntingdon and his nephew Kent, his cousin Rutland, the turncoat Nottingham, the young John Beaufort, whom he had so lately made an earl, and three members of his own household, Sir William Scrope, his chamberlain, Thomas Lord Despenser, and the Lollard Sir John Montagu, who had just succeeded his uncle as Earl of Salisbury. All, except Scrope, Huntingdon and Montagu, were very young men. On the news of this project being divulged, there was some stir in the realm; the king found himself obliged to forbid prayers and processions on behalf of the imprisoned lords, and to call up a great number of Cheshire archers to swell his bodyguard.

When parliament met in September, the house of commons was packed by the sheriffs in the king's interest; in some counties no proper form of election had been observed. It re-elected as speaker Sir John Bushy, the delator of the unfortunate Haxey during the last session. The houses were informed that they would not have to try the Duke of Gloucester, as he had expired in his prison at Calais on August 27, carried off by the disease under which he had been labouring at the moment of his arrest. This statement disguised a deliberate murder; Gloucester had really been smothered by the king's orders on September 9. Richard had feared to bring him up for trial. Accordingly, he gave orders to Nottingham, who had crossed to Calais after the duke's arrest, to extort a confession of treason from him if possible, and then to make an end of him. Gloucester proved recalcitrant for some weeks, and it was only on September 8 that, in deadly fear for his life, he consented to make formal confession that his acts in 1387-88 had been treasonable. This confession was written out and handed to a judge, Sir William Rickhill, who was sent over to Calais: after this the king had no further use for his uncle. Next day Nottingham informed the duke that he was to be moved to another prison, led him from the castle to an inn in the town, and there had him smothered by murderers directed by John Hall, one of his squires, and William Serle, one of the king's valets. Richard directed his uncle's confession to be read to the parliament, but suppressed the date on which it had been made, and the clauses at its end in which Gloucester begged piteously for his life, in the language of one who knew that he was probably condemned to perish. If they had been

CHAP. recited to the house no sane man could have believed that the
V. duke died a natural death on the next day.¹

Arundel and Warwick remained to be dealt with. They were accused by the eight appellants on September 21, the king having declared the pardons which he had given them in 1388 to be null and void, as extorted by force. Before their trial began the Speaker Bushy demanded in the name of the Commons that justice might also be done on Archbishop Arundel who, as the chancellor of Gloucester's faction, had been a consenting party to all his treasonable deeds. The king refused the primate leave to reply, ordered him from his seat, and announced that he should consider his case. His brother the earl was first disposed of; when "appealed" by his eight accusers Arundel bore himself with reckless courage; he answered taunt by taunt, gave his old fellow-conspirator Henry of Derby the lie direct, and reproached the king for his consistent perfidy. When told by the Speaker that the faithful commons of the realm sought his punishment as a traitor, he cast a sarcastic glance upon Bushy and asked: "Where are the faithful commons? As for *you* I know well what you are." Richard himself grew so excited that he spitefully asked the earl whether he now regretted the day when he had refused to spare Sir Simon Burley's life. When Arundel had been condemned, and his sentence read to him by John of Gaunt as high steward, he was hurried away to execution. Public opinion was much shocked by the fact that the guard of Cheshire archers which led him to the block was commanded by two of his nearest relatives, by Nottingham who had married his daughter, and Kent his nephew. He died with dignity and courage, protesting that he was no traitor, but the true friend of England.

Warwick bore himself in a different fashion before his judges. He broke down completely, owned with tears and sobs that he was a miserable traitor, threw all the blame on Gloucester, and begged pitifully for his life. Richard was in an ecstasy

¹ The business of Gloucester's death, the king's tampering with his confession and the date of his murder are well worked out by Mr. James Tait, in the *Owens College Historical Essays*, 1902, where it is shown that the genuine record was inserted in the Parliamentary Roll of Richard's eleventh year, so that it might escape observation.

of delight as he heard his old enemy so abasing himself. "By St. John," he exclaimed, "Thomas of Warwick, it pleases me more to hear you making your confessions, than to know that I have got all the lands of your friends Gloucester and Arundel!" He gave the earl his life, commuting his sentence to exile in the Isle of Man, and forfeiture of all his property. The fact that Gloucester's trial could not take place because of his death did not prevent a formal judgment being pronounced on him; he was declared a traitor, and his estates were confiscated. As to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the king had reserved for him precisely the same punishment that the lords appellant had inflicted on Archbishop Neville. He was banished the realm, and forcibly translated, by the pope's assistance, from Canterbury to schismatic St. Andrews, which he could never hope to visit. The vacant archbishopric was given to Roger Walden, Dean of York.

It only remained that Richard's accomplices should be rewarded. All his appellants received portions of the estates of Gloucester, Warwick, or Arundel, and nearly all were given magnificent titular preferment. For the first time in English history the title of duke was made almost vulgar, for it was conferred on no less than five persons on one day. Nottingham was created Duke of Norfolk; Kent, Duke of Surrey; Rutland, Duke of Aumerle; Huntingdon, Duke of Exeter; Derby, Duke of Hereford. In addition, Despenser was made Earl of Gloucester; Scrope, Earl of Wiltshire; Beaufort, Marquis of Dorset. Other magnates, who had not taken such a prominent share in the business, also received promotion, the Lord Neville becoming Earl of Westmorland, and Sir Thomas Percy, the king's seneschal, Earl of Worcester. No man could accuse Richard of being an ungenerous paymaster in the day of his victories.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TRIUMPH OF HENRY OF LANCASTER.

CHAP. VI. BETWEEN September 29, 1397, the day of the adjournment of the parliament that saw the death of Arundel and the banishment of Warwick, and the day when Richard signed the document which stripped him of his crown, September 29, 1399, there intervened precisely two years. But as he spent the last two months of that period as a fugitive or a prisoner, the time of his despotic rule, his "tyranny," as some of his enemies called it, endured for no more than twenty-two months, all packed full of incident. He was intoxicated with success, and determined to rule at last according to his own arbitrary will. The nation and parliament had bowed before him with unexpected subservience; hardly even a murmur had been heard. In 1387 he had failed in his first snatch at autocracy because he had no sufficient following of faithful adherents; in 1397 he had gathered a formidable band of supporters, and had bound them to himself by the double tie of blood shed in common and of plunder equally shared. He does not seem to have appreciated the fact that, despite the duchies and earldoms which he had showered upon them, they were not strong with the strength of the old feudal families. Only Mowbray and Montagu were territorial magnates of real importance: the Hollands, Aumerle, Scrope, Despenser, Beaufort, despite their late gains of confiscated land, were not the real equals of the ancient baronial houses. Their high titles belied their real insignificance—they were a court noblesse and little more; in common parlance they were dukelings and not dukes.¹ The whole of them combined did not possess nearly so great territorial power as the

¹ Quos vulgares derisorie vocabant non Duces sed Dukettos, a diminutivo (*Annales Ricardi II.*, p. 223).

single house of Lancaster. They proved a slender reed to lean upon when the spirit of the nation grew surly and the king needed armed support. Richard seems to have thought that with a packed upper bench in the house of lords and a packed Commons below, he might venture upon anything. He was so far right that he certainly might have reigned for many years, had he but displayed common prudence and ruled his tongue aright. But, tired of ten years of self-suppression and dissimulation, he was determined to have something more than the reality of power: he must needs flaunt his prerogative in the nation's face at every possible opportunity, exulting in freakish displays of arbitrary power, and epigrams worthy of Caligula or Nero. Who could tolerate a king who let slip the *obiter dictum* that the laws of England were in his mouth, and sometimes in his breast still undivulged, not in any statute book? Who could live safely under a sovereign who dared assert before a large audience that the lives and lands of his subjects were his own, to be dealt with according to his good pleasure, despite all legal forms?¹

Some historians have suggested that Richard was a little mad in his latter years; but if so there was method in his madness. His attacks on the constitution were carried out with cunning and ingenuity. The most deadly of them was delivered during the first meeting of parliament which followed his victory of September, 1397. In the following January the houses were ordered to assemble at Shrewsbury. The Commons were still the packed assembly of the late session, with the obsequious Bushy as speaker. The eight lords appellant came forward to demand that all the sentences, judgments and confiscations passed by Gloucester's faction in its day of power should be reversed, and all its laws repealed. This was done; the king declared, at the request of both houses, that all the acts of the parliament of his eleventh year were null and void. He also revoked the judgment passed upon Suffolk in 1386, and went out of his way to declare that the two Despensers, the favourites of Edward II., had been illegally condemned and executed in 1326; even such ancient

¹ I see no reason to doubt these stories from the "Articles" of 1399. Each saying is reported to have been made before many witnesses.

CHAP.
VI

defenders of the royal prerogative must be rehabilitated.¹ A more ominous subject was introduced when Richard raised the question of the famous "opinions of Nottingham," of August, 1387, and induced the houses to vote that the answers of the judges on that occasion had been good law truly set forth. By this decision they committed themselves to the statement that all attacks on the prerogative were treason, and that they could not themselves discuss any questions save those laid before them by the king. As a small supplementary addition to the "appeals" of the previous autumn, two noted supporters of Gloucester, in 1387, were dealt with—Lord Cobham, and Sir Thomas Mortimer, who had murdered the constable of Chester at Radcot Bridge. Cobham, who was in custody, was condemned to life-long imprisonment in the isle of Guernsey; Mortimer had fled to Ireland and taken refuge with the king's enemies, so could only be proclaimed an outlaw and convicted traitor.

On the next day, January 31, 1398, the Commons granted the king a tenth and a half, and a fifteenth and a half, for the coming eighteen months, and, what was of far more importance, gave him the subsidy on wool for the rest of his natural life. With such resources added to his normal revenue he might have avoided summoning parliaments for the future, except in times of dire financial crisis. But this grant was of trifling concern compared with a bill passed on the same afternoon. On the futile pretext that there was a great bulk of business into which the parliament had not time to make inquiry—the said parliament having sat but three days—it was proposed by Speaker Bushy that the two houses should delegate their powers to a small committee, who should discuss and determine these questions. The committee was to consist of ten lords temporal,² two other lords acting as proctors for the lords spiritual, and six members of the com-

¹ Possibly, however, this was enacted more to protect the inheritance and position of the new Earl of Gloucester, the great-grandson of the younger Despenser.

² *Viz.* : The king's uncles, Lancaster and York, seven of his lords appellant, Aumerle, Surrey, Exeter, Dorset, Salisbury, Wiltshire, Gloucester, and, in addition, the Earls of Northumberland, Worcester, and March. Note that Norfolk and Hereford do not appear. The commoners are Speaker Bushy and Henry Green, John Russell, Robert Teye, Richard Chelmswick and John Golofre.

mons. Six lords and four of the lower house were to form a quorum. The committee was of course shamelessly packed; it included seven of the lords appellants and only two representatives of the older baronage (Northumberland and March), as well as Speaker Bushy and five others of the king's unscrupulous adherents from the Commons. To this preposterous body of nominees there was conveyed "power to examine, answer and determine all the petitions before parliament, and the matters contained in them, as well as other matters moved in the presence of the king and undetermined business depending from them, as they shall deem best, according to their good advice and discretion, by authority of parliament". To put it shortly this partisan committee was entrusted with most of the rights and duties of parliament. It is questionable whether the barons and burgesses understood how far they were voting away their own privileges, but the king knew precisely what he was doing, and in the succeeding year used this body of delegates as his most precious instrument of governance. It seemed as if he had succeeded in inducing parliament to commit suicide; there was no check left on his authority.

A personal quarrel between the two greatest of the peers who had been Richard's tools and accomplices during the late *coup d'état* enlivened the last day but one of the parliament (January 30). Henry of Lancaster, Duke of Hereford, delated Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, for using treasonable language and trying to draw him into a conspiracy. According to the information which he laid against his sometime friend and ally, Hereford had been riding from Brentford to London a month ago, in December, 1397, when he fell in with Norfolk on the way. After some conversation the latter had asked him whether he was aware of the perilous situation in which he now stood. Henry, according to his own story, replied that he did not understand what his companion meant. Thereupon Norfolk explained to him that the king, despite his present show of affection to them both, had never forgiven their doings in 1387-88 at Radcot Bridge and elsewhere. "All that has been forgotten, and we have ample pardons, and are in the best of favour," said Hereford. Norfolk replied that Gloucester and Arundel had pardons too, which had not much availed them, and added that he had certain information that John

CHAP. Holland, Scrope, Salisbury, and Despensers, the king's most
VI. intimate friends, were daily urging their master that he would never be safe while two of the original lords appellant still survived. They would before long persuade Richard to make an end both of himself and of Hereford; some day the king's hand would fall upon them. Hereford, so he declared, answered that he would believe no such foul accusation against his master. He thought it his duty, he said, to divulge the whole conversation, and had been directed to report it to parliament. He now sought pardon for all offences that he had ever given to the king, a grace which Richard readily granted.

This was an astonishing move on the part of Henry of Hereford. If his story was true, and there seems every reason to believe it, he had acted in an unchivalrous and disgraceful fashion in betraying Norfolk's indiscreet confidences. And his turpitude was equalled by his folly, for Norfolk was undoubtedly right in his suspicions; Richard, though he had fawned upon the two dukes while they were of use to him, can never have forgotten that they had once been Gloucester's allies; nothing is more likely than that, as Norfolk supposed, he had already marked them out for ultimate destruction. Hereford, however, blind to this probability, sought to destroy Norfolk, either in order to curry favour with the king, or because of some private grudge. By so doing he had given Richard a chance of destroying him: for if the king chose to disbelieve him, he might be accused of having brought false accusations against his fellow-magnate and be disgraced as the vilest of perjurers. Richard must have felt inclined to shout for joy when he saw how his cousin's delation of Norfolk had placed in his hands the happy choice between crushing the one as a false accuser or the other as a traitor. He seems to have hesitated which course to adopt; he summoned both dukes before him at Oswestry on February 23, where Hereford renewed his charge and Norfolk gave him the lie direct. The king then declared that he would lay the matter before his new parliamentary committee, which met at Bristol on March 19. The committee referred it to a court of chivalry, which assembled at Windsor on April 28 and decided that a judicial duel would be the proper way to end the dispute, since

neither of the two dukes could produce witnesses or documents to back his version of their wayside interview. It looked as if the king had resolved to throw the decision upon the hazard of the lance ; and Hereford was considered the better jousting pair.

CHAP.
VI.

But Richard's plan was deeper : it had already occurred to him that it would be best of all to remove not one but both of the dukes. Lists were prepared at Coventry on September 16, and the appellant and defendant had taken their places, lowered their vizors, and couched their spears, when the king suddenly threw down his truncheon, stopped the combat, and called Hereford and Norfolk to the foot of his throne. He then announced that he had decided to take the decision of the matter into his own hands, and to banish both the rivals, Hereford for ten years, Norfolk for life, because at the court held at Windsor he had confessed to some, though not to all, of the charges made against him. For exiling Hereford the king gave no more excuse than that it was necessary to prevent factious quarrels and maintain the peace of the realm. But every one could see that if the appellant's charges were true, as the heavier penalty imposed on Norfolk implied, it was monstrous injustice to pass any sentence whatever upon him. Popular sentiment, which had been estranged from Hereford when he made himself an informer, veered round in his favour. Richard so far recognised this fact that he reduced his cousin's exile from ten to six years, bade him adieu with many polite phrases, and handed to him letters commendatory to the King of France, and other foreign princes. But such hollow courtesy could not cloak the injustice done. Richard had created for himself a rival with a legitimate grievance, and had to bear the full odium of his iniquitous proceedings.

When Hereford and Norfolk had taken their departure the king seems to have considered that his hands were completely free ; he plunged into a series of captious and arbitrary acts, as unwise as they were unconstitutional. The only person in the realm whom he thought it worth while to propitiate was his uncle of Lancaster, for whom, despite his banishment of Hereford, he professed a great regard. Just before the Coventry meeting he had intruded Henry Beaufort, John's

CHAP.
VI.

third son, into the bishopric of Lincoln. He was a mere youth of twenty-two, and his predecessor, John Bockyngham, who refused to resign, was translated against his own will to Lichfield, to the great scandal of the clergy. This despotic act was but typical of Richard's whole policy in 1398-99. The list of his misdoings during the last year of his reign contain some extraordinary items. Perhaps the most astonishing was that he proclaimed that seventeen southern and eastern counties had committed treason in their corporate capacity in 1387, by sending their levies to join the army of the lords appellant. Having declared all previous pardons invalid, he now imposed on them a fine of arbitrary amount, called *Le Plesaunce*, because he fixed it at such a sum as he pleased. The money was not actually raised, but the proctors of the counties were forced to sign and seal bonds of obligation for it, which Richard announced that he should produce whenever he thought fit. In a similar fashion, under the mistaken idea that he could make his subjects obedient by keeping penalties hanging over their heads, he compelled many private persons to seal blank deeds, which he could fill up as he pleased if they offended him. He also borrowed great sums of money by forced loans—an old grievance—and pledged his word to discharge these debts, but refrained from doing so, in order to interest his creditors in the stability of his throne. Nor was borrowing his only means of extorting money; he is accused of raising purveyances and tallages at his will, and covering his proceedings by the assent of the parliamentary committee, to which the ordinary powers of parliament had been conveyed at the disgraceful session of Shrewsbury.

We are told that Richard grew more and more elated by his arbitrary power as the months rolled on, that he used words of unseemly violence at the council board whenever objections were raised against any of his proposals, that he brow-beat the judges, and caused numerous persons to be seized and kept in prison for an indefinite time without trial. He also imposed a new oath on all his sheriffs, binding them not only to arrest traitors, but to delate all persons, whatever their status, who criticised the royal acts or spoke ill of the royal person. It must be conceded that, although there was so much sound and fury in Richard's words, he was comparatively merciful in his

deeds: only two persons in all seem to have been condemned for treason during his time of tyranny, and neither of these was executed. But his general conduct was intolerable—he frightened all men though he struck down but few—and it was clear that he was growing more ungovernable every day. It is said that he had vague dreams of greatness floating before him, and listened to soothsayers, who promised that he should ere long be elected emperor and become the first prince on earth. It would seem that this idea had been fostered by some overtures made to him in 1397 by several of the German electoral princes, who were discontented with his drunken brother-in-law, Wenceslaus of Bohemia.

On February 3, 1399, died John of Gaunt, who is said to have fallen into a lingering sickness after his son's banishment, mainly out of mere sorrow of heart. The king at once seized upon the whole of his enormous estates, though at the time of Hereford's banishment he had assured him that he was in no wise disinherited or deprived of his civil rights. Indeed, Henry had been specially allowed to appoint proctors to receive seizin of any property that might accrue to him in his absence, and do homage in his name. On March 18 Richard, with the assent of his parliamentary committee, declared his cousin an exile for life, cancelled the letters patent by which he had been given leave to delegate his rights to his proctors, and declared the whole Lancaster inheritance to have escheated to the crown. This was an act of mere wilful tyranny; Hereford had done nothing in his absence which could be twisted into the least semblance of disloyalty, and it became evident that his exile had been decreed with the deliberate intention of defrauding him of his birthright. But Richard seems to have been quite unconscious of the storm of wrath and contempt which his act had provoked, and to have underrated the influence and daring of his cousin.

Just before he confiscated the Lancaster estates, Richard had announced his intention of departing for many months to Ireland. His presence beyond St. George's Channel had been rendered necessary by an untoward incident. The effect of his visit to Ireland in 1394 had gradually worn off, and many of the native chiefs had relapsed into rebellion by 1398. There was specially friction with Art MacMurrough of Leinster, who had

- CHAP. VI. promised the king to surrender his fastnesses in the Wicklow hills in return for other lands, and refused to carry out his pledge.
- When threatened with outlawry he made a sudden descent into the Pale, took and sacked Carlow, and defeated and slew the lord-lieutenant, the young Earl of March, who had come out against him with a hastily-gathered levy of the Englishry of Kildare, on August 15, 1398. This disastrous combat at Kells not only shook the foundation of the royal power in Ireland, but deprived Richard of the destined successor to his throne: the rights of March passed to his two infant boys. The king swore that MacMurrough should pay dearly for his victory, and ordered ships and stores to be collected at Bristol and Milford for an expedition, which was to sail after Easter. By April the preparations were far advanced; money, horses and a military train had been procured, mainly by taxing the religious houses in a flagrantly illegal fashion. The majority of the baronage had been summoned to follow the king; all were directed to bring comparatively small contingents, but to see that they were well equipped and provided for a long campaign. On May 29 Richard set sail, taking with him his large bodyguard of Cheshire archers, his treasure, and the crown jewels and regalia. He was accompanied by the Dukes of Aumerle and Exeter, the Earls of Gloucester, Salisbury and Worcester, his cousin the young Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Lincoln, and many magnates more. His nephew the Duke of Surrey had gone before with a small force to rally the English of the Pale. There were two notable absentees from the host, the Earl of Northumberland and his son, Henry Percy; they had been ordered to attend, but sent polite excuses that troubles on the Scottish march prevented their appearance.

It will be noted that Richard took with him nearly all his trustworthy adherents. Of his appellants only Scrope Earl of Wiltshire, the lord-treasurer, and the Marquis of Dorset were left behind. He had taken the precaution of dragging in his train the heirs of the exiled Hereford and the murdered Gloucester, two young boys destined to unequal fates: the one was to be the victor of Agincourt, the other was to die of the plague ere he attained his fifteenth year. The charge of England was handed over to the old Duke of York as lieutenant of the king: he was incapable of mischief himself, but Richard

does not seem to have reflected that he was also incapable of keeping others from it. As councillors and assistants York had only the Earl of Wiltshire, Sir John Bushy, the obsequious Speaker of the late house of commons, with Sir Thomas Green and Sir William Bagot, two of Richard's household knights, tools whom he had used in many of his most illegal and unpopular acts.

CHAP.
VI.

The army landed at Waterford on May 31. After resting six days at that port Richard advanced to Kilkenny, and then plunged into the rugged territories of MacMurrough. During the month of June he was occupied in fruitless marches and countermarches in the Leinster mountains. The Irish refused to give battle, but hung about the invading army, harassing it by unexpected attacks and nightly alarms. Sometime early in July, Richard, having exhausted all his provisions, came down to the sea at Arklow, and marched by the coast-road to Dublin, where he arrived with a dilapidated and half-starved following. He was just about to recommence operations, when about July 10 Sir William Bagot arrived from England, bringing the disastrous news that the whole north was in revolt under the banner of Henry of Lancaster. By a strange fatality no ship had come in from the east for many days; it was six weeks since any certain news had been received of what was going on beyond St. George's Channel. Richard at once sent off Salisbury, the most trusted of his lieutenants, to raise the faithful county of Chester and the North Welsh. There was not enough shipping at Dublin to carry the whole army, and the king determined to make a forced march to Waterford, and there pick up the fleet which had brought him to Ireland. This resolve cost him a week of precious time; he embarked in haste and got a fair wind, but it was only between the 22nd and the 25th that his ships came straggling into Milford Haven. Meanwhile all had been lost in England. Henry of Lancaster had landed at Ravenspur on the Humber on the 4th, having with him the young Earl of Arundel, the earl's uncle the banished archbishop, and an armed retinue of not more than 100 persons. But he came to friends who had been warned to expect him; ever since the decree that had robbed him of his inheritance he had been in communication with malcontents all over the realm: even per-

CHAP. sons so high in Richard's favour as the Marquis of Dorset had
VI. been corresponding with him. His father's vassals in Yorkshire and the midlands had sent him secret assurances of their fidelity, and the northern earls, Northumberland and Westmorland, were certainly in the plot.

It is only the fact that half England had sent him encouragement which explains Duke Henry's debarkation in Yorkshire at the head of such a handful of followers. He knew that he was certain of instant succour; within two days he had been joined by many of the tenants of the Lancaster estates; within a week Northumberland and Westmorland and the Lords Willoughby and Greystock had come in. At a great assembly held at Doncaster, Henry swore to them all that he had come, not as traitor aiming at the crown, but merely to claim his father's inheritance, and to drive away the king's mischievous favourites and ministers. Pretenders generally begin with such professions, but it is certain that most of Henry's adherents were already determined to set him on the throne, and that he himself had no other end in view.

Meanwhile the old Duke of York had sent off Bagot to warn King Richard, and had summoned all the forces of the south and the midlands to meet him at St. Albans. The shire-levies came in great numbers, but the gentry hung back; only 1,000 lances could be collected after many days of waiting. But men-at-arms and archers alike let it be clearly understood that they had no wish to fight the Duke of Lancaster, and regarded his cause as just. York perceived that it would be insane to march against the invader and offer battle. After some hesitation he moved westward, leaving London uncovered, and proposing to join the king when he should have disembarked from Ireland. Henry took the same direction, with the object of demolishing or winning over York's army before Richard should appear. Thus the two forces, moving on converging lines, came into contact between Bristol and Berkeley on July 27. Among all the magnates of the royal army only the Bishop of Norwich and Sir William Elmham attempted to make their men fight; both were taken prisoners after a trifling skirmish. The rest of the troops joined the rebels without any hesitation, and York was

forced to follow their example, and to pretend that he was satisfied with his nephew's professions of loyalty to the crown. Scrope, Bushy, and Green escaped to Bristol, and shut themselves up in the castle, but the governor, Sir Peter Courtenay, surrendered at the first summons, and gave up the refugees. Lancaster ordered, or allowed, them to be beheaded in a tumultuary fashion by his followers, without any trial.

Some days before Bristol fell, the Earl of Salisbury had arrived at Chester, and gathered a force in the king's name. Richard himself too had just landed at Milford Haven. It seemed likely that there would be sharp fighting, though the rebel army much outnumbered the two isolated bodies of royalists. But the king's heart failed him; he dreaded treachery among his followers, and when the news of the defection of York and the death of Scrope reached him, he deserted his army by night and fled into North Wales, accompanied only by Surrey and Exeter and a small escort. Apparently he intended to join Salisbury's force, having more confidence in the Cheshire men than in any other of his adherents. On discovering that their master had fled, Worcester and Aumerle disbanded the army from Ireland, and after some hesitation joined the enemy. Lancaster meanwhile marched at full speed up the line of the Welsh border towards Chester. At his approach the Earl of Salisbury retired into the mountains, and Cheshire submitted. On receiving this news the earl's levies melted away, and he was forced to shut himself up in Conway Castle with the wrecks of his force. Here, when it was too late, he was joined by the king, and had to inform him that, although a week before he had been at the head of several thousand men, there remained only some five-score under his banner. Richard now spent a miserable fortnight, hurrying about between the castles of Beaumaris, Flint, and Holt, seeking apparently for some way of escape, but was back at Conway on August 14. From thence he sent his kinsmen Exeter and Surrey to parley with Lancaster, who still lay at Chester. The duke in return sent Archbishop Arundel and the Earl of Northumberland to visit him at Conway. After conference with them Richard agreed to surrender; he consented to abdicate, asking nothing more than that his life should be spared, that an honourable livelihood should be assured to him, and that his last adherents,

CHAP. VI. Exeter, Surrey, Salisbury, Gloucester, Bishop Merke of Carlisle and his secretary, John Maudeleyn, should be given a safe conduct.¹

These terms being conceded, Richard rode to Flint on the 19th, and gave himself up to Lancaster, who received him with hypocritical politeness, and informed him that he had come to help him to govern England better than it had been ruled for the last twenty-two years. The captive was then separated from his friends, and taken up to London under escort. Lancaster forced him to enter the capital riding on a little hackney and robed in a plain black gown; he was greeted with hoots and insults, while the victor was welcomed with royal honours. Richard was shut up in the Tower; the duke took possession of the Palace of Westminster. Arundel at the same time dislodged his intrusive successor, Walden, from Lambeth, and reassumed his functions as primate. Parliament had been summoned in Richard's name to meet on September 30. But on the day before the session began England ceased for the moment to own a king. Richard had consented to execute a formal deed of abdication, in which he owned himself "insufficient and useless," and declared himself unworthy to reign; he read it aloud in his chamber in the Tower before Lancaster, Archbishop Arundel, and other witnesses. By it he released all his subjects from their allegiance, and made the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Hereford his proctors, for the purpose of presenting his resignation to parliament.

His bearing at this dismal ceremony, as the chronicles inform us, was tranquil, even cheerful. We should have expected an outbreak of hysterical wrath; but Richard's temper on any given occasion was incalculable. Energy and apathy, over-confidence and abject depression came to him at the inappropriate moments. It is astounding to find that a prince of such high spirit twice allowed himself to be humbled without offering resistance—in 1387 and again in 1399. Why did he not stake his fortune with De Vere at Radcot Bridge, or lead his Irish army to face Lancaster's levies? His enemies called

¹ The story given by Créton and other admirers of Richard, to the effect that when he surrendered he was deluded with a promise that he should not be deposed, cannot be credited.

him a coward: the king who will not couch a lance in defence of his ancestral crown must expect such taunts. Yet remembering his bearing before Tyler's horde, we cannot adopt such a simple explanation of his conduct. He was a creature of moods, and his moods always visited him at the wrong time. If he had not been thoughtless, arrogant, and overbearing in 1398, he might have reigned for many a year. If he had shown common resolution in 1399, he might have made a fair fight for his crown: it was by deserting his army at Milford that he ruined himself. Later events showed that he possessed many friends, and that they would have defended him if he had given them the chance. It was not the deaths of Gloucester and Arundel that doomed him to destruction, but his vain boasting, his petty interferences with the liberties of his subjects, his fits of passion, his senseless acts of injustice to men of minor importance. He had succeeded in persuading his subjects that no man's life and property were safe under his rule, that he was not merely aiming at revenge on his old foes the lords appellant, but at exercising a freakish tyranny that would touch every man. Like Domitian

periit postquam cerdonibus esse timendus
Cooperat; hoc nocuit Lamiarum caede madenti.

Yet few tyrants have shed so little blood—if few have made so many foolish boasts concerning their prerogative. Richard cannot be called cruel, nor was he a notorious evil liver, nor a thriftless weakling. Nevertheless he fooled away the crown which kings intellectually, as well as morally, his inferiors preserved to their death-day. It is useless to lay the responsibility for his fall on the heavy heritage received from his grandfather: debt, unlucky wars, popular discontent. He lived down his early troubles, ruled successfully for nine years, and then deliberately drew down upon himself a second storm by his *coup d'état* of 1397 and the twenty-two months of arrogant tyranny that followed. No sovereign was ever more entirely the author of his own destruction.

On the next day, September 30, the two houses assembled, to find an empty throne facing them. Richard's proctors read his deed of abdication, and the primate formally proposed that it should be accepted. At his suggestion a list of articles,

CHAP. VI. setting forth the reasons that rendered Richard's removal necessary, was rehearsed. It contained thirty-three clauses, which summed up all his evil doings, not only his acts of the last two years, but the old offences of 1386-87. Both his constitutional sins and his acts of oppression against individuals are set forth at great length. He had levied civil war, exacted arbitrary taxes and purveyances, interfered with the law courts, raised forced loans, imprisoned his subjects without trial, alienated the royal estates, forced the parliament of Shrewsbury to delegate its authority to an illegal committee, extended his prerogative beyond all ancient precedents. He had also caused Gloucester "*occulte suffocari, strangulari, et murdrari*," and Arundel to be beheaded, in spite of their pardons; he had banished and disinherited Henry of Lancaster, exiled the primate, and imprisoned Warwick and Cobham, though all of them possessed similar charters of pardon for their offences. When the recital of the articles was ended both houses voted that "for the greater security and tranquillity of the nation and the good of the realm," the king should be deposed. A commission of four peers and three commoners was chosen to execute the sentence, and their president, the Bishop of Llandaff, read a formal declaration that Richard was deprived of his royal office "on account of his perjuries, cruelties, and many other crimes," and that the throne of England was thereby vacant.

Immediately on the completion of this act Lancaster rose from his seat among the dukes and claimed the crown. "In the name of God, I, Henry of Lancaster, challenge this realm, this crown, and all the members and appurtenances thereof, as by the right blood coming of King Henry, and through that right that God of His grace hath sent me, with the help of my kin and my friends, to recover it; the which realm was in point to be undone, for default of governance and undoing of the laws." The form of words was curious: Henry claimed the crown by right of conquest, which was undeniable, but also by right of descent, which was inexplicable, unless he wished to set forth a theory that the throne of England could descend to male heirs only; otherwise the children of the Earl of March stood before him in the succession as descending from Lionel of Clarence. Of such a theory the duke said nothing, nor did

he mention Edward III. as his progenitor, but Henry III. It would seem that he was hinting at a silly tale put about by his adherents to the effect that his maternal ancestor, Edmund "Crouchback," Earl of Lancaster, had been the elder son of Henry III., but excluded by his father from the throne in favour of Edward I., on account of his personal deformity. This theory had been seriously discussed at a council of bishops, doctors, and others, held on September 21, and had been apparently put aside; there was good proof, both in the chronicles and in state records, that Edmund was born long after Edward, and his nickname "Crouchback" had no reference to any bodily defect. It was shameless of Henry to ground a claim on a lying tale which his own followers had refused to back, and which he did not even venture to set forth in full. But his reference to Henry III. seems to prove that he thought it worth while to recall the legend. His real claim rested only on conquest, and on the assent of parliament which was about to be granted him. For without a moment's delay the Lords spiritual and temporal and the Commons voted that they would have him for their king, and Archbishop Arundel took him by the hand and installed him on the vacant throne. It is notable that no one said a word in favour of the young Earl of March, whom Richard had designated as his heir. In the last precedent for a royal deposition—that of Edward II.—parliament had duly recognised the nearest of kin to the outgoing sovereign. But things were different in 1327; Edmund of March's claim was not so direct as that of Edward III. had been, and though it would have been a conceivable course to propose that he should be crowned and Lancaster rule as his regent, no such suggestion was made. It cannot have been forgotten that there was good precedent for regarding the crown of England as elective, and for passing over March, even as Arthur of Brittany had been passed over in 1199.

Henry of Lancaster, therefore, was for all intents and purposes an elective king, who came to the throne under a bargain to give the realm the good governance which his predecessor had denied. In one sense his position was strong, he had for the moment an immense majority of the nation at his back; but in another sense he was weaker than any of his predecessors for many a year. He had sanctioned the theory

CHAP. VI. that kings can be deposed for misrule, and if his own administration proved unfortunate, it was open to any malcontent to raise against him the cry that he had himself raised against King Richard. When rebels brought against him the same charges of thriftless misrule that had been fatal to his predecessor, he had to refute them with the sword. He kept his throne only because he proved a statesman of sufficient ability to conciliate a majority of his subjects. He had to perform miracles of tact, energy, and discretion, in order to keep that sufficient majority of the nation at his back. He succeeded in the task, and ultimately won through all his troubles to a period of comparative safety and tranquillity. It was a weary and often a humiliating game, for Henry had to coax and wheedle his parliaments where a monarch with a strictly legitimate title could have stood upon his dignity and appealed to his divine right to govern. But the story is intensely interesting, as being the first episode of what we may call constitutional government in the modern sense.

CHAPTER VII.

REIGN OF HENRY IV. : THE EARLY TROUBLES.

AT his accession King Henry IV. was a man of thirty-four, which in those days meant a man already well within the bounds of middle age. He had married at sixteen, and was now a widower with six children, four boys and two girls, of whom the eldest, Henry of Monmouth, was in his thirteenth year. He was a stoutly-built powerful man, with a handsome but rather broad face, and a short peaked russet beard. He had an extraordinary and untiring fund of vitality : he was a practised jouter in the lists, and an experienced soldier. But it was perhaps as a traveller that he was most notable : he had twice been to the Holy Land, and once had gone off to the edge of Christendom in order to serve on a "crusade" with the Teutonic knights of Prussia against the heathen of Lithuania. Henry was courteous, affable, and tactful, and these were the qualities which in the end enabled him to keep his crown safe. Energetic and untiring as he was, he might have failed to maintain his hold on England if he had been stiff-backed and arrogant. His suavity was the more remarkable because he had naturally a high temper ; but he succeeded in keeping it in check on all but a very few occasions. He was unscrupulous, as all who study the exact details of his dealings with his unhappy predecessor must acknowledge, and he was cruel on occasion, when cruelty could do him no political harm. But on the whole we shall wonder at his moderation in bloodshedding ; his doing away with Richard II. at Pontefract was, putting morals aside, a necessary and politic act from his own point of view, and justified itself by its results. Altogether, he was a solid, practical, wary personage, the very opposite of his unfortunate predecessor, Henry was

CHAP.
VII.

CHAP.
VII.

certainly not an amiable character, though he was far from being a monster of wickedness or a mere Machiavellian plotter. With his combination of tact and energy, unscrupulousness and caution, he was precisely the sort of sovereign who could make usurpation succeed, and establish a dynasty on foundations that had originally been anything but secure.

On the Wednesday following Henry's election the committee of seven named to execute the deposition of Richard II. went to the Tower and read to the ex-king the sentence which parliament had passed on him. Richard replied "that he knew well that they were saying nought but that with which they had been charged," and "that he hoped his cousin would be a good lord to him". He showed a cheerful countenance, and made special request that he should be given an honourable livelihood. Probably he thought, like Agag, that "the bitterness of death was passed," and failed to comprehend that there could be no real pardon for him: while he lived King Henry's throne was insecure.

The first parliament of King Henry IV. met on St. Faith's day, October 6, 1399, for a mere formal session, all real business being postponed till after the coronation. Archbishop Arundel, who opened the proceedings, made the usual promises that come so easily to the ministers of a new sovereign—all old franchises and liberties should be preserved, justice should be administered without respect of persons, "the king would be counselled and governed not by his own proper will, but by the common advice and consent of the honourable and sage persons of his realm". On the following day the convocation of Canterbury met at St. Paul's, to hear assurances that the king would not only refrain from asking for grants of money, but that he intended to take vigorous measures for the suppression of heresy. Henry was resolved to support Archbishop Arundel through thick and thin in his campaign against the Lollards, in return for the invaluable aid which he had received from the primate during the last three months. Six days later the coronation took place with such pomp as could be contrived at short notice. All the old ceremonies were observed: the appeal to the people was duly made, and answered by the loyal shouts of the assembly; the old coronation oath was recited, and Arundel anointed his

master with oil from the crystal *ampulla*, which now appeared for the first time among the regalia. An astounding tale was bruited about concerning this little vessel: it had been given by the Virgin to St. Thomas Becket, preserved for two centuries in obscurity at Poitiers, discovered by the Black Prince, forgotten by King Richard, and so reserved by divine favour to be first used by the pious Henry of Lancaster, the true friend of the Church. The houses met again upon the following day; it was an ominous sign of the times that the speaker whom the Commons had chosen, Sir John Cheyney, was forced to resign at once, because he had been accused of Lollardy by Archbishop Arundel. Under his successor, Sir John Doreward, the Commons opened their business by petitioning for the abrogation of all the acts of King Richard's parliament of 1397-98, and the rehabilitation of all the statutes of the "Merciless Parliament" of 1388. Henry assented in effusive terms, declaring that he looked with horror on the proceedings of the parliament of Shrewsbury, especially on the unconstitutional vote which had delegated the powers of Lords and Commons to the detestable parliamentary committee. The passing of these bills produced widespread confusion, for all the victims of King Richard in 1397 were restored not only to their titles and honours, but to their lands and goods, which the late king had distributed among his adherents. What still remained in the hands of Richard's minions was taken back, but the attempt to recover for the old owners property which the usurpers had sold, or given, to innocent third parties, caused endless litigation and discontent.

A few days later the Commons asked for an inquiry into the responsibility of Richard's councillors concerning five points—the murder of Gloucester, the exile and disinheritance of the present king, the banishment of Archbishop Arundel, the execution of his brother the earl, and the setting up of the parliamentary committee of January, 1398. They desired to discover who had aided and abetted Richard in each of these misdeeds, and to secure their punishment. The first person examined, Sir William Bagot, proved a voluble witness. He poured out upon the house all the secrets of 1397, including many which the new king was by no means anxious to see divulged. Pressed concerning the death of Gloucester,

CHAP.
VII.

he said that the Duke of Aumerle was as deeply concerned in the murder as Norfolk had been, and that there were other peers who had approved all King Richard's actions. First Aumerle and then the two Hollands, the Dukes of Surrey and Exeter, sprang to their feet, gave the witness the lie, and challenged him to justify himself by a judicial duel. Next day King Henry asked the advice of the house of lords whether he should order the arrest of Aumerle and the other appellants of 1397 in consequence of Bagot's evidence. Lord Cobham, one of the victims of the late king's *coup d'état*, rose to advocate the measure in a truculent speech, and when Aumerle began to defend himself, Lord Fitzwalter hurled his hood at him, and offered to prove him a murderer by combat in the lists. Dozens of other peers followed Fitzwalter's example, and the floor of the house was littered with a pile of gages. The guilt of Aumerle seemed proved beyond reasonable doubt by the evidence of John Hall, the servant of King Richard, who had been entrusted with the actual murder of Gloucester. With the shadow of the inevitable gallows behind him, Hall deposed that two of Aumerle's body-squires had helped him in the foul deed. After making his confession the witness was hung, drawn and quartered that same afternoon, October 18.

King Henry's next step was to arrest Aumerle and the other lords appellant of 1397, and also Merke, Bishop of Carlisle, who had been one of Richard's confidential advisers. They were to be impeached without delay. Meanwhile the Commons petitioned that measures should also be taken to deprive the deposed monarch himself of the power of doing further mischief. The matter was debated by the Lords. Northumberland proposed that Richard should be secluded in some safe place, denied all intercourse with his friends, and be allowed neither to send out nor to receive letters. The motion was carried, and five days later the captive was taken from the Tower, at night and in disguise, and spirited away no one knew whither. It was only some weeks later that it became known that he was in the Castle of Pontefract, guarded by Robert Waterton, the king's master of the horse, and Sir Thomas Swynford, a half-brother of the Beauforts. So secretly had matters been conducted that varying rumours got about

to the effect that he had already been put to death, or had escaped to Scotland. CHAP.
VII

On October 29 the trial of Richard's partisans took place. They made a contemptible exhibition of themselves, with the exception of Bishop Merke, who simply protested that he had neither advised nor known of the murder of Gloucester. The lay peers pleaded that they had only appealed Gloucester, Arundel, and Warwick because they were under constraint and in personal fear of King Richard. As one after another made paltry excuses, the lords, who showed little of the temper of judges, burst out into repeated clamours of wrath and indignation; Fitzwalter again challenged Aumerle to a duel, and Thomas, Lord Morley, defied Salisbury in the same fashion. The defendants were taken forth from the court in a state of abject depression, and had to wait for their sentences till November 3. Mobs of Londoners hung about the Tower hoping to witness their decapitation. But a batch of executions would only lay up a blood-feud against the house of Lancaster; if the heads of the houses of Holland, Montagu, and Despenser, with the heir of York, went to the scaffold together, Henry would be accused, after the passions of the moment died down, of having started his reign with a butchery such as England had never seen before.

He resolved to lean to the side of mildness, and to risk the danger of allowing his enemies to survive. On November 3 Chief Justice Thirning read out the sentences of the accused to the parliament. Justice was to be tempered with mercy. Aumerle, Surrey, and Exeter were to be degraded from their rank as dukes, and to resume again the titles of Earls of Rutland, Kent, and Huntingdon, which they had held before 1397. Beaufort was to lose the Marquisate of Dorset, and to sink back to the rank of Earl of Somerset, and Despenser was to abandon the earldom of Gloucester and to resume his ancient barony. Salisbury, having received no promotion from King Richard, had no new status to lose. All lands, charters, grants of money, and immunities which the lords had received since August, 1397, were forfeited. For their other possessions they "stood in the king's grace" which he was pleased to extend to them. They were prohibited for the future from giving their "liveries" to any one save actual servants of their house-

CHAP.
VII.

hold, obviously in order that they might have no opportunity of collecting armed bands. Any private person who had been wronged, either by them or by their retainers, was invited to make his plaint to the king and was promised strict and swift redress. Finally, the lords were warned that if any of them at any future time adhered to King Richard, they would be considered traitors and subjected at once to the penalties of high treason. Bishop Merke was deprived of his see, but given a manor and forty marks a year for his maintenance. Sir William Bagot, more lucky than his late colleagues Bushy and Green, was allowed to retire to his ancestral manor of Packington after spending eighteen months in prison.

The other doings of the parliament of 1399 were not without importance. The Commons voted the king a subsidy on wool for three years, and confirmed to him a tenth and a fifteenth for 1400, which had already been granted to Richard II. But the most important constitutional feature of the session was an act which provided that the king should not make grants of land or bestow offices of profit upon any man without first taking the advice of his council. This sounds like a mere echo of old complaints against Richard II., but was in reality called forth by his successor's action. Already Henry had out-heroded Herod by his lavish gifts to the men who had placed him on the throne. The greedy Percies had received more than the much-maligned Suffolk had ever enjoyed, Neville had been presented with the earldom of Richmond, and all the minor partisans had been abundantly rewarded. It was shutting the stable door after the horse had been stolen to legislate twelve weeks too late against the abuse of royal patronage. Henry was probably glad to assent to a statute which would give him a good excuse for abstaining from further liberality, but he took the precaution of granting this petition of the Commons with a proviso "saving his royal liberty," which would leave him free to do much as he pleased in the future.

For a moment it looked as if domestic affairs would settle down after the dissolution of parliament on November 19. Foreign affairs gave no great cause for anxiety. Some marauding Scots had captured and burnt the castle of Wark, but the Scottish government, as usual, disavowed them and

made effusive apologies. With France relations were more strained, owing to the close affinity between the French king and Richard II. But just when Charles VI. had begun to protest, and to demand back his daughter and 200,000 francs of her dowry, he fell into one of his fits of insanity, and during his incapacity his ministers did no more than continue to apply for the restoration of the little eleven-year-old queen. Henry, anxious to keep money in England, suggested that she should be divorced from Richard, and married to his own eldest son, Henry of Monmouth. The French gave no encouragement to this scheme, but made no hostile demonstrations. Isabella was a valuable hostage, and they wished to get her and her dowry back before showing their hand. With the other states of Europe there was no friction whatever, and Henry prepared to keep his first Christmas feast at Windsor with a cheerful spirit. There was to be a great "mumming" and a tournament on Twelfth Night. But, contrary to all expectation and probability, a serious crisis broke out before the festivals were due.

In face of the unanimous enthusiasm which the nation and the parliament had shown at Henry's coronation and the execration which had been poured on the name of Richard, it seems surprising that the partisans of the deposed king should have dreamed of armed revolt at this juncture. Reason would have bid them keep quiet for a space, till the first popularity of the new king had passed away. But passion urged them on, and five of the six surviving lords appellant (Beaufort naturally clung to his brother and the new dynasty), Rutland, Huntingdon, Kent, Salisbury, and Despenser, took counsel with other known friends of Richard, such as Bishop Merke, Lord Lumley, and the Abbot of Westminster, and planned an insurrection. The lords were to meet at Kingston-on-Thames two days before the king's festival at Windsor, and to bring with them all the retainers that they could muster. That night they were to make a sudden dash at the castle, and capture or kill Henry and his heir. Confederates in Windsor had promised to contrive their entry by a secret gate. Richard was then to be proclaimed king once more. The whole plan hinged on the possibility of seizing Henry; if he escaped, it was certain that he would be able to assemble an army

CHAP. greater than the conspirators could command. But if his
VII. head were off, they hoped that his party would crumble away, even as King Richard's faction had done in the preceding July.

Treachery intervened to frustrate this *coup-de-main*, yet it was betrayed so late that King Henry was saved only by a few hours of warning. Who was the traitor? The best chroniclers take refuge in generalities; one source says that the matter was divulged by a woman; but the most detailed and probably the most correct version is that the miserable Rutland, always a broken reed to the party he was serving, frustrated the scheme. On January 4, 1400, as the tale runs, his accomplices sent him word to be at Kingston with his retinue that same night. Struck with qualms at the eleventh hour, and well aware that failure meant inevitable death, he revealed the plot to his father and asked his advice. York, remembering what an evil account of his stewardship he would have to give to a restored Richard, forced his son to turn informer. The fateful message from York which revealed the conspiracy reached Windsor that afternoon. Henry, appalled at the sudden danger, bade his sons mount in haste, though night was coming on, and galloped away with them to London. He did not think himself safe till the mayor had closed the gates and called out the city militia in his name. Orders were simultaneously despatched to the sheriffs of the home counties to raise their levies.

Meanwhile the conspirators had met at Kingston with 400 lances, and (either because they were disquieted at missing Rutland from the muster, or because they feared that the assembly of such a company might be noised abroad) struck their blow a day earlier than they had intended. They beset Windsor Castle before dawn on the morning of the 5th, were admitted at a postern by their friends within, seized the fortress, and learnt to their intense chagrin that the king had fled ten or twelve hours before. They must either pursue him, or fall back on Wales and Cheshire, where they had many friends prepared to rise. Next morning they advanced a short way towards London, as if about to brave the king in his stronghold. They had been joined by Despenser, Lumley, and many others, and had over a thousand horsemen in their train. It is said that the miserable Rutland slipped out to meet them

at Colnbrook, his treachery not yet being known, and warned them that the king was marching to meet them with 16,000 men; he then fled back to London. This much at least is certain, that at Colnbrook they halted, hesitated for a few hours, and then suddenly turned back in hasty flight for the west.

The king was already in pursuit, and at Maidenhead on that same evening his vanguard came into contact with their rear. Kent halted, and held the passage of the bridge till dark, when he slipped off unpursued after the main body of his friends. On the 7th the fugitives made an astonishing march of some fifty miles, through Wallingford, Abingdon, and Farringdon, and reached Cirencester long after nightfall. The royal army had lost touch with them, and taken the Oxford road, so that it seemed likely that the rebels might escape to Wales. But meanwhile they were completely exhausted by their wild ride, and encamped, without any military precautions, in the villages round Cirencester. Only Kent, Salisbury, and Lord Lumley, with their personal retinues, entered the town and lodged themselves in its chief inn. They had omitted to reckon with the widespread hatred which the name of Richard still inspired. The men of Cirencester took counsel in the night, and resolved to strike a blow for the house of Lancaster. They beset the inn at dawn, blockaded the three lords, and forced them to surrender. No rumour of the conflict seems to have reached the scattered bands of rebels outside till all was over, at nine o'clock in the morning. When Despenser and the other chiefs heard of the fate of the earls, they were completely demoralised; instead of attacking the town to deliver their friends, they fled each to the point where he hoped to find safety. Only one attempt was made to save the prisoners, and that was fatal to them. A chaplain of Kent's household set fire to the town, in the hope that the townsfolk would disperse to save their homes, and that the captives might escape in the confusion. He succeeded in setting several houses ablaze, but the result was not what he expected. Determined that their prisoners should not escape, the men of Cirencester let the conflagration rage unheeded, but dragged the two earls and Lord Lumley out of the abbey into the market-place, and beheaded them then and there.

CHAP.
VII.

Salisbury, a consistent Lollard, refused to listen to a priest who offered to confess him, made his own prayer apart, and died without the hasty shrift which his companions received. He was the best of King Richard's friends, a scholar and a poet as well as a soldier. If we could forget the ignominious figure that he cut at the great trial in October, 1399, he might pass for an honourable knight and a loyal servant. A contemporary who knew him well,¹ observes that of all men he had met this earl seemed to be the one in whom God had put most of good, and that he doubted not that his soul was with the saints—testimony all the more striking as it comes from an orthodox churchman.

Those of the rebel chiefs who had not perished at Cirencester were soon taken. Despenser got on board a ship at Cardiff, but the sailors recognised him, and put into Bristol, where they handed him over to the mayor. On January 16 the men of that city beheaded him without a trial, and sent his head to King Henry. It was a curious coincidence that his ancestor, the favourite of Edward II., had perished in the same city, and by the same illegal death, seventy-four years before. The Earl of Huntingdon, the elder of the two Hollands, had not joined in the *coup-de-main* on Windsor, but was secretly organising a rising in London when his nephew took the field. Hearing of the failure of his friends, he fled down the Thames in a small boat, but foul weather drove him on to the coast of Essex, where he was recognised, apprehended, and lawlessly slain by a mob outside Plesshy Castle. The king executed in a more regular fashion at Oxford no less than twenty-six knights and squires who had joined in the rising, and several more were hanged in London. Of all the chief conspirators there only survived Bishop Merke, who was punished by being translated to the see of Samosata *in partibus infidelium*, where no one dwelt but wild Turks.

A more august victim than Kent and Salisbury was doomed to perish in consequence of their rising. On February 17 it was announced that King Richard had died at Pontefract upon the feast of St. Valentine. The official story was that he starved himself to death on hearing of the failure of the insurrection. It is impossible to say that this version

¹The Frenchman Créton, who wrote the narrative of King Richard's fall.

is not true; Richard was cursed with such a wayward and moody temperament that in the depths of despair, after hearing of the wreck of his last hopes, he may have cut short his own life. At the same time we have the strongest reasons for disbelieving this story. Confidential advisers of the new king had been urging that there would be no peace while Richard lived. If he were gone, it was much less likely that conspiracies would be made in behalf of the next heir, the eight-year-old Edmund of March. Every one expected to hear that the ex-king was dead after the rebellion of Kent and Salisbury had been put down. A sinister minute of Henry's privy council, taken down on one of the first days of February, runs to the effect that "in view of popular reports concerning the death of Richard, it would be well that if he be alive, as is supposed, strict measures should be taken to keep him safe, but if he be dead, his body should be openly showed to the people". About a fortnight later he was dead, and the order for the exhibition of his corpse was issued on February 17. It is probable that the chroniclers are right who explain that he was done to death by systematic privations, cold, heavy chains, close confinement, insufficient clothing, and insufficient food. In the words of Adam of Usk, he perished "heart-broken, fettered, and denied common nourishment by his tormentor, Sir Thomas Swynford".¹ A very few weeks of privation in January and February cold would kill a prisoner pent in a medieval dungeon. Whether Richard perished of actual starvation, or of some rheumatic fever, pneumonia, or congestion of the lungs, brought on by cold and low living, he was equally murdered.

The obscurity about his end gave rise to two popular legends; one, that which Shakespeare has preserved, is to the effect that he was hacked to death with axe-blows by a knight, an unknown Sir Piers Exton, to whom King Henry had delegated the details of the murder. The second, widely current in the twenty years that followed his death, was that he had escaped from prison by the contrivance of a priest and a jailor, and had got away to Scotland. That a person, a lunatic or an impostor, was maintained by Robert III. and styled Richard

¹ See the important footnote on p. 79 of Sir E. Maunde Thompson's second edition of Adam.

CHAP. VII. Plantagenet is certain ; but he was not the captive of Pontefract. The corpse of the real Richard was borne by slow stages to London, exposed in St. Paul's, and then buried without state in the Dominican priory of King's Langley in Hertfordshire.

For some months after the suppression of the rising of Kent and Salisbury it seemed as if England were settling down into quiet under the new government. The king's chief adviser was Archbishop Arundel—who had shared his exile and his triumph—the head of the militant Church party, and the strenuous foe and persecutor of the Lollards. Arundel did not hold any secular office at this moment: the chancellor of 1400 was John Scarle, an obscure official who knew his work but had no personal initiative. John Northbury the treasurer was equally insignificant. The really important members of the new ministry were the constable and marshal, Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, and Ralph Neville, Earl of Westmorland—the two great northern lords who had given the new king his first start upon the way to power, by joining him immediately after his landing at Ravenspur. Percy, the more notable man of the two, was at this moment second only to Arundel in the king's confidence, and had been loaded with gifts and honours of all kinds. He was a factious, greedy, and unscrupulous feudal magnate of the worst type. Neville, though he had co-operated with Northumberland in the revolution of 1399, was and always had been his rival. The king intended to use him as a counterpoise to Percy's overgreat power. But in 1400 Northumberland was by far the greater figure at the royal council board ; he was supported by a numerous band of warlike kinsmen, of whom the most notable were his brother Thomas, Earl of Worcester, who had just been made high admiral, and his son Henry "Hotspur," the terror of the Scottish border, whose share in the spoils of the late king had been the Isle of Anglesey and the wardenship of the marches of North Wales.

In the spring of the year foreign politics were assuming a threatening aspect. The murder of King Richard nearly led to a breach with France ; the negotiations with Charles VI. took a turn for the worse in February, and it became known that a fleet was gathering in the Norman ports, and that the

malcontents of Aquitaine were sending emissaries to the Duke of Bourbon, the governor of Languedoc. But the war-scare died down when the French king fell into his usual imbecility in the spring, and by May his ministers were once more treating in a peaceful way for the restoration of Queen Isabella and her dowry. Henry had now dropped the idea of marrying her to his son, and was merely haggling about the money that he had to restore along with the person of the young widow.

Meanwhile, however, relations with Scotland took a war-like turn. This was mainly King Henry's own fault; the Scots were in a state of anarchy, caused by the wranglings of their king's son Rothesay, his brother Albany, and Archibald Earl of Douglas. None of the parties were anxious to plunge into war with England while their domestic broils were unsettled, and all were exchanging letters with the English court by separate channels, when a new feud arose. Rothesay repudiated his affianced bride, Elizabeth, daughter of George Earl of March, in order to marry Marjory, daughter of the Earl of Douglas. Incensed at the insult, March wrote to King Henry, promising to do him homage, and hand over to him Dunbar and all his other castles, if he would declare war on Scotland and cross the Tweed before August 15. This offer inspired the English monarch with an ill-advised ambition to revive the old claim of Edward I. to a direct suzerainty over Scotland. He rejected the pacific overtures of Robert III., and ordered the sheriffs to send their contingents for a muster at York at midsummer. The expedition was delayed by lack of money, for the king had not received any grant from the Commons this year. It only got under way when Henry scraped a few thousand pounds together by forced loans, one of the old devices of Richard II., for which he had expressed such horror at his accession. But he crossed the Tweed on August 14, and was joined at Haddington by George of March, who kept his promise by putting Dunbar, Fast Castle, and other strongholds into his hands. The Scots treated him just as they had treated Richard II. fifteen years before. Rothesay and Douglas shut themselves up in the impregnable castle of Edinburgh; Albany, the head of the other faction, collected an army on the Carron, but refused to stir out of the fastnesses of the Torwood. On August 29 the English

CHAP. had exhausted their provisions, and marched back to the
VII. border. This expedition, the last which a King of England ever conducted into Scotland in person, had been utterly fruitless. Even Dunbar Castle was lost in the autumn, being recovered by surprise by Sir Robert Maitland. The campaign cost much money, it led Henry to imperil his popularity by raising forced loans, it revealed him as a strategist no less incapable than his predecessor, and it opened up a long bickering frontier war, from which no profit could follow.

On his return journey towards London the king was met by the news that disturbances had broken out in North Wales. This trouble had, at the start, nothing to do with the recent conspiracies in favour of Richard II., though the Welsh had been well disposed to the late king. Nor was it in its first stage a national rising, though it afterwards assumed that shape. The greatest of the marcher lords of the north at this time was Reginald, Lord Grey of Ruthyn, a vehement partisan of Lancaster, and a violent and unscrupulous person, who used his court favour to aggrandise his estates. In 1400 Grey was at feud with several of his Welsh neighbours, especially with one Owen of Glyndwrwy—or Glendower, as the English chroniclers render the name—the most powerful gentleman in North Wales. Owen was a notable personage; he owned lands to the value of 300 marks a year, and his chief seat was at Sycharth, in the valley near Llansillin on the Cynllaeth. On the father's side he came from Griffith Vychan, to whom Edward I. had confirmed these estates in 1282, while he boasted that in the female line he could trace his pedigree back both to the old kings of Powys and to Llewelyn ap Griffith, the Prince of Wales. Owen was no wild mountain chief, but a travelled and lettered gentleman and a practised soldier. He had studied law at Westminster, served as squire in the household of the Earl of Arundel, and followed Henry of Lancaster abroad on some of his foreign expeditions. For some years he had been living in peace on his estates, and was now a man of forty with four promising sons. He was the most popular personage in the land, owing to his lavish hospitality, his affable manners, and his patronage of bards and poets, who found harbourage in his great wooden mansion, and sang of his wisdom and beauty,

his keen appreciation of a well-turned epigram, and the excellence of his mead and mutton. He was addicted to the study of prophecy, and knew every dark saying from the predictions of Merlin to those of John of Bridlington. It was probably this taste of his which made the English in after days call him a wizard, and say that he could, when he pleased, walk invisible.

CHAP.
VII.

Owen had an ancient lawsuit with Lord Grey. He had seen his pleas slighted and his oaths scorned, wherefore he took advantage of the anarchy of 1399 to revenge himself by a series of raids on the crops and cattle of the marcher lord. He had been summoned by King Henry to join in the Scottish expedition, but, busy in his private war, failed to appear, whereupon Grey denounced him as an open rebel. Glendower was not the only brawler on the march in 1400: we have a list of other stirrers-up of trouble, some of whom bear English names, such as Hanmer and Puleston. Their raiding was so impudent and widespread that Henry listened to Lord Grey's appeal, and came in person to pacify North Wales on his way from Scotland to London. When he marched up the valley of the Dee and through the mountains of Carnarvonshire, the offenders took to the hills, and made no attempt to defend themselves. Thereupon the king declared their estates confiscated, those of Glendower being given *en bloc* to Beaufort, Earl of Somerset. This bloodless campaign started a bitter guerilla war, which was to last fifteen years and to strain the resources of the realm to breaking point. It was not till the spring of 1401 came round, and outrages began to be reported from every valley of the northern march, that Henry discovered that he had turned Owen and his fellows from rioters into rebels.

The winter of 1400-1 was a time of quiet, and gave some hope of prosperity for the future. The king welcomed in London Manuel Palaeologus, last emperor of the East, but one, who came to plead for aid against the Turks, and was given 3,000 marks to hire mercenaries. The ambassadors of the other emperor, Rupert of the Palatinate, who had just supplanted the drunken Wenceslaus of Bohemia, were in England at the same time, suing for the hand of Henry's eldest daughter, Blanche, in behalf of Rupert's heir, Count Lewis. The proposal was

CHAP.
VII.

welcomed, and the marriage fixed for the next year, when the princess would attain the mature age of twelve.

The second parliament of the reign met on January 20, 1401—there had been no session in 1400. It was mainly notable for much cautious sparring on constitutional topics between the king and the Commons. The first flush of popular enthusiasm on the accession of the house of Lancaster was over, and although the lower house professed the utmost loyalty, and made liberal grants of a tenth and a fifteenth for one year, with tunnage and poundage for two, yet their proceedings augured a growing distrust of their new master. Their speaker, Sir Arnold Savage, knight of the shire for Kent, was a fluent orator with a taste for raising constitutional questions. In one speech he pleaded for more ample time to discuss the matters laid before the house, which, as he hinted, the king sometimes sent in without sufficient notice and at the very end of the session. In a second he raised the topic of freedom of debate, complaining that certain persons about the royal person occasionally gave garbled versions of what had been said in the house, and provoked their master's wrath against innocent and deserving members. Henry gave satisfactory assurances on both these points, but refused to listen to a third harangue from the eloquent speaker, and requested the Commons to put all petitions on paper for the future. Another important incident of the session was a protest against a grievance which was to crop up more than two centuries later, in the time of Charles I. When the French invasion was expected, in the spring of 1400, the council had directed the coastward shires and the seaport towns to man and pay for fifty-two ships from their own resources. The Commons protested that this early form of "ship-money" was illegal. Henry yielded the point, disavowed the order, and promised that no such levy should again be made without the consent of parliament. Another landmark in constitutional history was a petition by the Commons that redress should always precede supply. Obviously, if this became the rule, the Commons could extort favourable replies to every request, by threatening to close their purse-strings. The king put off his answer till the last day of the session: it was a polite refusal; but he was soon to hear more of this doctrine, the weapon by which the

lower house was ultimately destined to win its supremacy over the crown. CHAP
VII.

Important as these matters were, it was not because of them that the parliament of 1401 was destined to be remembered by every Englishman. The most notable act of the session was the promulgation of the detestable statute *De heretico comburendo*. The initiative came from the clergy and the king, but the Commons were consenting parties. On January 26 Archbishop Arundel stirred up the convocation of Canterbury to beseech the king that he would delay no longer in suppressing Lollardy by force. Their petition made no mention of faggot or flame, but it was generally understood what the punishment of the heretic would be. Burning at the stake, though, like heresy itself, almost unknown in England as a penalty, had been regularly employed upon the continent since the early thirteenth century. In response to the request of convocation the king and his council framed a statute which provided that "if a heretic refuses to make abjuration, or after abjuration is adjudged to have relapsed into his errors, the sheriff in the counties or the mayor in the cities shall take him, and burn him before the people in some public place, in order to strike terror into the minds of others". The terms of the statute had been approved by the Lords, but appear not to have been submitted to the Commons, whose approval was taken to be implied in a separate petition, by which they begged that "men or women, of whatever estate, imprisoned for Lollardy should be compelled to plead, and have such judgment as they have deserved, as an example to that wicked sect". When the statute was published, the Commons asked that it might not be enforced before Whitsuntide. On March 11 parliament was dissolved, and the statute *De heretico comburendo* received the royal assent, with the other bills, at the end of the session. Yet already on March 2 the first Lollard martyr had been burnt, under the Common Law.

Arundel had in his prison at mid-winter two noted schismatics—both priests—John Purvey, one of the translators of the Bible, and William Sawtré, of St. Osyth's Walbrook. Both were tried while parliament was sitting; Purvey broke down, recanted, and was permitted to creep away to his living of West Hythe. Sawtré was a man of a different temper. He

CHAP.
VII.

was charged on February 12 with having taught eight heretical propositions—four related to the worship of the cross, one to the uselessness of pilgrimages, but the most important was the central Wycliffite thesis that the material bread and wine remained in the sacrament after the words of consecration had been recited. Sawtré did not deign to use any of the weapons of scholastic dialectics, nor to disguise any of his convictions by ambiguous wording, as so many of his fellows had done. He adored Christ upon the Cross, but he would not bow down before the senseless wood; he thought almsgiving far more profitable than pilgrimage. Finally in the Eucharist “he said not that the wafer remained unchanged after consecration, but that it was then both very bread and also the very body of Christ; the material bread had not ceased to exist, but had become the bread of life”. The primate’s anger beat upon this steadfast man without causing him to stir an inch from his line of defence; then Arundel declared him a manifest heretic, degraded him from his orders, and reported his case to the king. Though the statute *De heretico comburendo* had not yet become law, Henry sealed on February 29 a writ directed to the mayor of London, bidding him take this incorrigible criminal and burn him alive in some public place. Four days later, Sawtré was led to Smithfield, “and there he was chained standing to a post in a barrel, packed around with faggots, and burned to ashes”. So perished the first Englishman who faced the fire for conscience’ sake, and refused to take the easy road of recantation.

The year 1401 was one of growing trouble and discontent, but singularly destitute of incidents of real importance. Queen Isabella was restored to her father in July, with her jewels and personal property, but without her much contested dowry. As to that point King Henry took refuge in the old plea, which had served on many other occasions, that King John of France had never paid his Poitiers ransom after the peace of Calais. By surrendering Isabella and keeping her money Henry lost a valuable hostage and gained a reputation for dishonesty. The French could pick a quarrel whenever they pleased. On the Scottish border raids were unceasing. Archibald, the Earl of Douglas, who had succeeded his father in the leadership of the anti-English war party, assaulted the

walls of Berwick and burnt Bamborough. The Duke of Rothesay, who had favoured peace with England, was now in prison, and his friends were scattered and depressed. CHAP. VII.

Meanwhile the internal condition of the realm was growing worse ; in face of the heavy taxation voted by parliament, men were beginning to ask themselves whether the new *régime* was much better than that of King Richard. There were riots against the levying of imposts at Bristol and Dartmouth, and in the autumn it is said that a mysterious attempt was made upon Henry's life. A barbed instrument like a great caltrop was found in his bed ; if he had lain down upon it, as he very nearly did, he would have been mortally injured. But the most gloomy feature of the year was the development of the Welsh disturbances into a serious national insurrection. When the spring came round and the outlaw's life upon the mountain side became bearable, and even attractive, all North Wales, valley after valley, rose in the name of Owen Glendower. It was said that even the Welsh students of Oxford sold their books and vanished, and that the Welsh labourers of Shropshire and Herefordshire all streamed back to the hills. Yet the danger was hardly understood in England till news came that on April 1 the rebels had taken by surprise the great castle of Conway, one of the keys of North Wales. Henry Percy, as justiciar of that region, was charged with the duty of recapturing it, and forced it to surrender on May 28. But this did not check the spread of the rising, and not only Carnarvon and Merioneth, but even Cardiganshire were infested by bands of rebels, who kept the castles of the lords marchers in a state of practical blockade. Owen Glendower felt so strong that he assumed the title of Prince of Wales—not borne by a Cymric ruler since David ap Grifffith perished at the parliament of Shrewsbury. He hoisted the old standard of the principality, a golden dragon on a silver ground. Hotspur found the rebels too many for him ; he could not get enough money from the king to pay the arrears of his men-at-arms, much less to raise the additional troops that he required. At last he threw up the justiciarship in anger, and retired to Northumberland. Henry therefore had to march against Glendower in person accompanied by his eldest son. He reached Worcester with the levies of twenty-two counties on

CHAP. VII. October 1, and thence marched through the disturbed districts as far as the Menai Straits, the castle of Harlech, and the remote abbey of Strata Florida. Glendower, while refusing to fight in the open, hung about the rear and flanks of the army, cutting off stragglers and baggage. On one occasion he captured the spare horses, wardrobe, arms, and tents of Prince Henry, and bore them off in triumph into the recesses of Snowdon. When the king had retired Owen again dominated the whole country.

Chance has preserved two curious letters which the rebel chief wrote that autumn, one to the King of Scots, the other to the native princes of Ireland. He makes strange appeals to Celtic myths and legends, and incites them to help him by quoting ancient prophecies of the success that would attend a combination of Wales, Ireland, and Scotland against the intrusive Saxon. But "God helps him who helps himself," and Owen's personal activity was the best pledge of success. He kept the war awake all through the winter of 1401-2, and in the February of the new year captured his old enemy Lord Grey, after a sharp combat near Ruthyn. Owen kept him in bonds for nine months, and only let him free for the enormous ransom of 10,000 marks.

The year 1402, therefore, began badly for King Henry, who did not make himself more popular by raising a stringent aid *pour fille marier* to dower his daughter Blanche. Nor did he conciliate his subjects by concluding a rather inexplicable marriage himself. On April 3 he was affianced to Joan, daughter of Charles II. of Navarre, the dowager-duchess and regent of Brittany. Probably it was part of a scheme for strengthening the English interest in France. But any plans which Henry may have built upon this foundation were destined to be disappointed. Joan could not carry the Bretons with her into the English alliance; when she announced her betrothal, they insisted that she should resign the regency, and placed the charge of her little son in the hands of her cousin, Philip of Burgundy. After she had passed the seas to England, she ceased to have any influence in the duchy, and her late subjects were the most vigorous of all the vassals of France in attacking her husband's fleets when war broke out between Henry and Charles VI.

In the autumn of 1402 it began to be bruited about that King Richard II. was alive in Scotland. A lady of the Anglo-Irish family of Bisset, who had been much at Richard's court, had married John of Dunvegan, the brother of Donald Lord of the Isles. One day she met an English beggar tramping over her husband's glens, and suddenly pointed him out as no less a person than the captive of Pontefract. There was probably some facial similarity, for other witnesses who had known Richard vouched at a later time to the fact that the beggar much resembled the king. The poor man himself seems to have been more or less crazy, "he oft bore himself as one half-wild," and spoke strange and wandering words. He refused to say either that he was or that he was not Richard of Bordeaux. The Duke of Albany, who had become all-powerful in Scotland since the death of his nephew Rothesay in March, 1402, saw that there was political capital to be made of him, brought him to one of his castles, and kept him in ostentatious secrecy, permitting no one to see him save those who were eager to be deceived. Henry IV. declared that he was one Thomas Warde of Trumpington, a crazy religious mendicant. This may or may not have been the case, but he was not King Richard; the chronicler Créton, sent over by the French court to identify him, reported that this was not the king that he had known in 1399, but a rank impostor. But in 1402-3 none save the few who had been the confidants of Henry IV. in the murder of his predecessor, and the still smaller number of competent witnesses whom Albany had permitted to visit his guest, could be certain that the mysterious stranger in Scotland might not be the true king.

The rumour that Richard was alive spread far, and was eagerly welcomed not only by friends of the old king but by the more numerous class which was growing discontented with the new one: it was at its height about Whitsuntide, 1402. The attention of the council was called to it by informers, who alleged that they had been sounded by strangers as to their willingness to take arms if Richard should enter his realm again. The most active of these emissaries were friars, though why such people should have intrigued against that obsequious son of the Church, Henry of Lancaster, it is hard to conceive. There followed arrests on a large scale; many laymen and

CHAP. some noble ladies were imprisoned, but the majority of the
VII. persons seized were friars, including the priors of the Dominicans at Winchester and Norwich, and the wardens of the Franciscans at Nottingham and Leicester. Most of the prisoners boldly avowed their attachment to Richard: "If he came I would fight for him, though I had no better weapon than a staff," exclaimed one friar. As was but natural these desperate loyalists were hanged—eight in a batch at Tyburn, others at Bristol, Lancaster, and elsewhere. The most prominent layman who suffered was Sir Roger Clarendon, a bastard son of the Black Prince.

While these executions were proceeding a terrible disaster occurred on the Welsh border. Glendower had raided Shropshire; to pursue him there came out all the levies of that county and of Herefordshire, under Sir Edmund Mortimer, the uncle of the little Earl of March. Advancing from Knighton the force, 8,000 strong, was surprised and routed by the rebels in the defile of Pilleth on June 17, 1402. Many were slain, Mortimer and several other knights were taken prisoners. On hearing of this mishap the king started off in person to take revenge. He marched himself with his main force from Shrewsbury, while two flanking columns operated from Hereford and Chester, the one under the Earl of Stafford, the other under the nominal charge of the king's eldest son, Prince Henry. This September campaign was, as usual, a failure; Glendower would not fight, and the English army suffered terribly from continuous rains, varied by tempests of hail and early snow, which caused the knights to swear that Owen must indeed be a sorcerer and in league with the devil.

While the king was retiring, foiled and weather-beaten, from the hills of Gwynedd, operations of a very different character took place in Northumberland. Open war with Scotland had been in progress ever since the raid on Bamborough in the preceding autumn. In September a Scottish force several thousands strong, led by Murdoch Earl of Fife, eldest son of the Duke of Albany, and Archibald Earl of Douglas, entered England, and ravaged as far as the Wear. Then, turning homeward, they were nearing the Tweed and had reached Homildon, or Humbledon, Hill, five miles from Wooler, when they found an English army ranged across their

path and ready to dispute their passage. The Percies had collected all their retainers, and had been joined by Cumbrian contingents under the lord of Greystock. The Scots, loaded with plunder, could not escape by a flank march, and resolved to make their way through by force. Douglas drew up his army on the slopes of Homildon Heugh, and was there beset by swarms of archery thrown out from the English line. He ordered his whole army to charge down the hill, drive off the archers, and then assail the men-at-arms arrayed in their rear. This produced a battle of the type of Dupplin or Halidon. When the Scottish masses began to roll down the slope, the archery gave back, more slowly on the wings and more rapidly in the centre, so that the advancing column found itself in a semi-circle of converging arrow-shot. The armour of the Scots was of no avail against the deadly shower of missiles; Douglas himself received no less than five wounds, one of which destroyed his left eye. The head of the column melted away as it crossed the valley: the main body broke and fled before they could come to handstrokes. The disaster was complete; the Lord Gordon, Sir John Swinton, Sir Alexander Ramsay of Dalhousie, Walter Sinclair, and eighty more gentlemen were slain. The prisoners included the wounded Douglas, Murdoch of Fife, three other earls, Orkney, Angus and Murray, the lords Montgomery, Erskine, Seton, Graham and Stewart of Abernethy, Sir Robert Logan, Admiral of Scotland, and many scores more of men of note.

When therefore King Henry met his parliament a fortnight after Homildon, he was able to pass lightly over his Welsh fiasco, and to speak of the Scottish victory as an almost miraculous proof of divine favour, which would enable him to dictate terms of peace to his northern enemies. The inevitable demand for large grants of money was made, the double campaign in Wales having completely exhausted the treasury. With some reluctance the Commons voted a tenth and a fifteenth, and renewed the existing customs, tunnage and poundage, for three years. They also petitioned that the king should show some special token of favour to the Percies for their great achievement. Northumberland was granted something like a formal triumph; he led in before the king and the two houses the Earl of Fife, the Lords Montgomery and Graham, and

CHAP. other prisoners, and presented them to his master. The Scots,
VII. placed on their knees before the throne, had to listen to a long allocution from the king, who finally assured them of his grace, and invited them, together with their captor, to sup with him in the Painted Chamber.

Nevertheless, within a few months Northumberland was the king's greatest enemy. The breach between the earl and his master started in the winter after Homildon. But the first signs of trouble that gave warning of the rebellion of 1403 came from another quarter. Sir Edmund Mortimer had now been a prisoner in Glendower's migratory camp for six months, and was anxious to ransom himself: but despite his repeated petitions, the king refused either to advance him money or to grant him facilities for raising it himself. Apparently he was glad to keep out of the way one who would be the natural leader of any plot that might be made in favour of the young Earl of March, King Richard's rightful heir: one, too, who was actually nearer to the crown by the strict law of hereditary succession than he was himself. Whether Mortimer was disloyal at heart before his capture is not known, but in the winter of 1402-3 he made up his mind to throw in his lot with Glendower, and at Christmas married his daughter with great state, and among prophetic hymns of triumph from the bards, who foresaw a notable future for the progeny of such a pair. On December 13 he issued a manifesto to his friends and vassals, informing them that he was leagued with the Prince of Wales for the purpose of restoring King Richard, if he were still alive, and if he were not, of placing the Earl of March on the throne. Mortimer's treason gave a new aspect to the rebellion; instead of being an anti-English national movement, it might now be considered no more than a branch of a legitimist rising against the usurping house of Lancaster, and many malcontents who would never have joined Owen were ready to adhere to Mortimer. His own vassals in Radnor Forest rose at once, and from thence the movement spread into Brecknock.

The spring and summer of 1403 were a most prosperous time for Glendower: despite the fact that Prince Henry and the Earl of Worcester were collecting an army at Shrewsbury, he resolved to throw himself into South Wales, which had

hitherto been undisturbed. On his appearance the country-folk rose to his aid on every side; on July 2 he took Dynevor Castle, on the next day Llandovery, and on the 4th Llandeilo. Two days later he surprised Carmarthen, the largest town of South Wales, slaying fifty of its English inhabitants. But the most striking part of his success was that many strong castles—among them Llanstephan, Dryslwyn, Newcastle Emlyn, Cerig Cennan—were betrayed to him by traitors in the garrisons. Only Pembrokeshire, “little England beyond Wales,” remained loyal, and repulsed his marauding bands when they crossed its border. Elsewhere he rode triumphant, and from all the strongholds that still flew St. George’s cross urgent messages went to King Henry, bidding him “come riding night and day with a great army” if he would prevent the whole principality from falling into Owen’s hands.

But Henry had other business in hand. The Percies had announced their adherence to the cause of Mortimer. For the last six months their discontent had slowly been ripening into treason. Their first grievance had been the king’s ingratitude for their good service done at Homildon; he had promised them a great reward, but it took the rather illusory shape of the grant of a palatine earldom across the Scottish border. It was easy to sign away rights over Teviotdale and Nithsdale and Ettrick, but they had to be conquered before the signature had any effect. When Hotspur was sanguine enough to attempt to take possession of the new palatinate, he was repulsed by the first petty castles that he attacked, and returned in wrath. But the main cause of the breach between the Percies and the king was money—the most fruitful source of dissension between all unscrupulous copartners in an enterprise. Northumberland and his kinsmen, notwithstanding the lavish rewards they had received, still had outstanding claims against Henry, mainly for the pay of the troops which Hotspur had levied against Glendower. The king thought that he had already given them so much, that he need not hurry about discharging new debts. He said that they had from first to last received £60,000 of the public money, and modern research can account for £41,000 actually paid over to them.¹ But over and above this quarrel there were other causes of dissen-

¹ See Sir James Ramsay’s calculation in *Lancaster and York*, i., 57.

CHAP.
VII.

sion; Mortimer was Hotspur's brother-in-law, and since his lapse into treason the king could not help suspecting his relations. Yet the question of the prisoners of Homildon was the actual topic on which the quarrel broke out. Northumberland had surrendered Murdoch of Fife and several other magnates to the king, but Henry demanded that Douglas and all the other captives of rank should also be made over to him. The earl refused to yield them till all his monetary claims on the crown should be discharged. After much wrangling, Henry ordered great levies to be made, nominally to invade Scotland, really to overawe the Percies by appearing in their country with an army at his back.

This brought matters to a head; before the royal forces had been mobilised the Percies broke into open rebellion. They would brook no refusals from the king they had made, and reckoned that he had outlived his popularity and might be overthrown by a sudden attack. They made elaborate preparations for their enterprise: Hotspur enlisted his captive Douglas and many other Scots in the plot. Communications were opened with Glendower and Mortimer, and it was agreed that they should all unite in proclaiming the Earl of March king, since Richard, as the Percies well knew, was most certainly dead. All the lords of the north were sounded; only Neville of Westmorland returned a wholly uncompromising negative to his old rival's proposals; the Archbishop of York, Richard Scrope, and Skirlaw, Bishop of Durham, lent a favourable ear. Thomas Percy, Earl of Worcester, though one of the king's most favoured servants, consented to join the plot without a moment's hesitation. Northumberland was old, and thought fit to hand over the conduct of the campaign to his son Hotspur, for speed and daring were necessary in order to anticipate the king's projected march to the north. Henry Percy's plan was to join the two areas of insurrection by marching to join Glendower on the upper Severn. He resolved to throw himself into Cheshire, which had always been loyal to Richard II., and, after raising its levies, to meet the Welsh at Shrewsbury. The weak point of this project was that Glendower was at the moment out of touch, in the far south of the principality. On July 6, the very day upon which Hotspur started his march, Owen captured Carmarthen. The message

calling him back to Shrewsbury arrived too late, for the campaign was short and furious. CHAP.
VII.

Hotspur started from Northumberland with a following of only 160 lances, among whom were Douglas and twenty other Scottish knights. Riding fast, he reached Chester on the 9th, and was there joined by the Earl of Worcester, who had slipped away secretly from Prince Henry's side. The possession of Chester, which links Wales to the north, was a strategic gain of high importance, but there was a weak point in the arrangements of the rebels. Northumberland, who was busy collecting the main body of his retainers in Yorkshire, would not be ready to join his son for some days; Glendower was far away in the south. Till they should come up, Hotspur, with the van of the insurgent host, was left isolated and exposed to King Henry's attack. Though all Cheshire had joined him, he had probably not more than 3,000 or 4,000 men in hand. His fate depended on whether the king would strike before Northumberland and the Welsh arrived. Meanwhile he published a fiery proclamation in which he accused Henry of having violated all the promises that he had made in 1399, of murdering Richard II. by slow starvation, of raising illegal loans and taxes, packing his parliaments by intimidation, and ignoring the rights of the Earl of March. All was true enough, but it did not come with a good grace from the mouth of the Percies, the usurper's chief confederates.

The king was at Lichfield on the 11th, when he received the news that Hotspur had seized Chester. His levies were not yet assembled, but he saw the necessity of striking before the rebels had united, and hastily gathered the contingents of the nearer midland shires. His army had grown to some size by the 18th, and he marched on Shrewsbury, rightly judging that this was the point at which Hotspur would strive to join Glendower. Prince Henry was holding the town with a small force which he had collected for an expedition into Wales. On the afternoon of the 20th, the king advancing from Lichfield, and Hotspur marching from Chester, reached Shrewsbury almost simultaneously. The rebels thereupon drew back a short way, seeing that they had arrived too late to secure the town. On the next morning Hotspur drew up his host in an open space called Hatley Field, two miles and a half north of Shrews-

CHAP.
VII.

bury. He occupied a rising ground, partly taken up by cultivated enclosures covered by a dense crop of peas, and approachable only through narrow lanes, which the royalists would have to pass before they could deploy for the fight.

Henry, however, was resolved to push matters to an issue, and marched out of Shrewsbury at dawn as far as the field now known as the King's Croft, where he ranged his army in two divisions, one commanded by himself, the other by his fifteen-year-old son, the Prince of Wales. He decidedly outnumbered the rebels, but they had all the advantage of the ground. Before the battle several hours were spent in insincere negotiations; the Earl of Worcester took the chief part in the parley, and finally broke it off, taunting his late master with being a king whose word no man would trust. About noon the royalists advanced; they were delayed by the pea-fields and the narrow lanes, and suffered severely from the archery of the Cheshire men, before they could get to close quarters and make their superior numbers tell. When the king had at last got his bowmen to the front, and the exchange of shafts was growing deadly, Hotspur and Douglas resolved to try the effect of a down-hill charge upon the royal right, where Henry was present in person. Their impetuous rush almost achieved its purpose; the king's banner was beaten down, and the Scottish earl slew with his own hand Sir Thomas Blount, one of two knights who had donned a surcoat with the royal arms, in order to distract attention from their master. But when the impetus of the rebel charge was spent, the royalists enclosed on both sides the wedge of assailants which had penetrated into their line, and at the same time the Prince of Wales on the left outflanked and drove back the right wing of the Percies. Though in danger of being surrounded, the enemy continued fighting fiercely till their leaders were struck down. Douglas was felled by a wound in the groin, Hotspur killed outright by an unknown hand in the thick of the *melee*. When the cry "Harry Percy dead" was raised by the king's men, the Cheshire levies broke and dispersed. They were pursued for three miles, and many scores of knights and squires, the flower of the county which had been so loyal to King Richard, were slain or taken, with a great proportion of their archers and billmen.

The Earl of Worcester, Sir Richard Vernon, and Sir Richard Venables, the three chief prisoners, were beheaded next day; their heads were sent to decorate the spikes on London bridge, while that of Hotspur was reserved for the gate of York. The victory had been a costly one for the king; there fell in his host the Earl of Stafford, constable of England, nine knights, and a great multitude of the commons. Some years later Henry erected a church and hospital on the site of the central combat, where 1,600 corpses of both sides were buried in long trenches about the spot where the royal banner had stood. The news of "Hatley Field" put an end to the rebellion. Northumberland had raised an army in Yorkshire, but had been detained from following his son to Chester by the operations of his rival Westmorland, who had taken the field with the northern royalists. On hearing of the deaths of his son and brother, he disbanded his host and threw himself upon the king's mercy, pleading that he had been led astray by the vehemence of Hotspur and Worcester. Henry pardoned him, but put him in ward for a space, and ordered him to surrender all his castles to royal garrisons. He was released on February 6, 1404, and restored to his estates. Much future trouble would have been spared to England if this slippery and unscrupulous old man had been tried and executed immediately after his surrender.

When Hotspur had been slain, Worcester beheaded, and Northumberland imprisoned, it might have been supposed that King Henry's troubles for the year 1403 had come to an end. This was not so. Both South Wales, which had been left uncouraged during the Shrewsbury campaign, and the south coast of England called for his presence. While the king lay at York a large French fleet had captured and sacked Plymouth and committed other outrages in Devonshire. This was astounding news: the truce with France was still standing, and no hostile message had been received from the council of Charles VI. A few weeks later news came that a land army 10,000 strong had entered Guienne. These breaches of the peace were the work not of the French government, but of the Duke of Orleans, who had sent a personal defiance to King Henry in the preceding autumn, in the character of the avenger of Richard II., and affected to regard himself as at private war

CHAP. with England. So weak was the ministry that governed in
 VII. the name of his insane brother, that it made no attempt to restrain him; indeed great officers of state such as the Constable d'Albret and the Admiral de Trie took part in the two raids. Fortunately neither of them did serious mischief; the army in Guienne captured no more than a few small castles; the sack of Plymouth was the only serious exploit of the fleet.

The English king had reached Worcester on September 2, and halted there for some time, partly because he had not yet sufficient information to enable him to decide whether it would be better to invade Wales, or to move down to defend the south coast, partly because he had spent all his money on the Shrewsbury campaign, and could raise no more. He at once summoned a "great council" to consider the financial crisis. There followed a very acrid dispute as to the best way of getting money at short notice. A suggestion was made that a loan from the wealthier clergy would meet the case. But Archbishop Arundel withstood this proposal; he would have no forced loans or benevolences, though he undertook that convocation should give liberally when it was summoned. But the money was needed without delay, and convocation would take weeks to assemble; wherefore, as we are told, some of the king's knights openly advised their master to appropriate the prelates' sumpter beasts for his baggage train, and their pocket-money for his military chest. Arundel, in not unnatural wrath, replied that his retainers should resist if his property was attacked, and Henry gave way, borrowing from the prelates only a few hundred pounds on the security of the next vote from convocation.

It was, therefore, with an ill-equipped army and an almost empty purse that Henry marched from Worcester into Wales. The French fleet had left the Channel, so that he was able to turn all his attention against Glendower. From Hereford the royal army advanced through Brecknock and over the Black Mountain, and reached Carmarthen on September 29. Once more the rebels refused to fight, and took to the hills, just as they had done in 1401 and 1402. The king restored the walls of Carmarthen, and left there a strong force under his half-brother, the Earl of Somerset, to keep open communication with Pembrokeshire. He then disbanded his army. No

sooner was he gone than the insurrection burst out again in full force, and a small French squadron appeared in Carmarthen Bay, and communicated with the rebels. Aided by a few French knights Glendower advanced into Glamorgan-shire and threatened Cardiff. The harassed king ordered his lately dismissed troops to reassemble in haste at Gloucester and Chepstow. But they were not needed. The French cruisers disappeared and Owen went back to the hills, so the levies were once more sent home.¹

Even this was not the last alarm of the unhappy year 1403. On December 6 another French fleet beset the Isle of Wight. It was commanded by Waleran, Count of St. Pol, a firm ally of Orleans, and a relation of Richard II., whose half-sister, Maud Holland, he had married. The islanders were taken by surprise and offered to ransom themselves. But while Waleran was waiting for his money, the whole levy of Hampshire was thrown across the Solent, and on December 10 such a formidable array assailed the French camp that the count reembarked in haste and sailed back to Normandy. Though this news was satisfactory to the king, he was soon cast back into gloom by tidings from South Wales. Early in December, Glendower reassembled his hordes, and falling suddenly upon Cardiff, surprised and burnt the town and forced the castle to surrender. A few days later the vast stronghold of Caerphilly, the most perfect type of the Edwardian castle in all Wales, also yielded, despite its triple concentric walls. Owen's strength at midwinter was greater than it had ever been before; the fall of the Percies had not weakened his position.

¹ The insignificant French diversion in South Wales in 1403 has often been confused with the more important landing in 1405 under the Marshal de Rieux. For the latter see pp. 199-200.

CHAPTER VIII.

KING HENRY AND HIS PARLIAMENTS.

CHAP. THE aspect of domestic affairs was not cheerful when Henry
VIII. faced his fourth parliament at Westminster on January 14, 1404. At every session the temper of the Lords and Commons was perceptibly less loyal and more captious than at the last. Now they had advanced to a stage of virulent criticism and positive discourtesy; instead of rejoicing over the victory of Shrewsbury or the repulse of Count Waleran, they set to work to upbraid the king for the unthriftiness of his governance and the ill-success of his expeditions. The ghost of Richard II. would have smiled grimly at hearing every charge that had been made against himself transferred to the account of his successor.

The Commons began by choosing as their Speaker Sir Arnold Savage, whose tedious eloquence and love for hunting up constitutional grievances had so much annoyed the king in 1401. When the chancellor, Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Lincoln and half-brother to the king, laid before the houses the dangerous state of the realm, the ravages of Glendower and the French pirates, the continuance of the war with Scotland, and the exhaustion of the treasury, the storm of criticism broke out at once. The main thesis urged by the critics was the old grievance that the chief cause of the king's poverty was his extravagance, and especially the grants and pensions made to courtiers and favourites. "Knights who, at the king's landing in 1399, were not worth 100 marks were now enjoying five or ten times that revenue. The royal squires were as rich as barons." All the small special revenues of the crown had been granted away for long terms. The queen was maintaining a horde of greedy Breton *protégés*. The households kept at

Westminster, Windsor, and the Tower, not to mention other palaces, were out of all proportion to the real needs of the royal family. The Speaker finally declared that the wars, Welsh, Scottish and French, were not the real cause of the national poverty,¹ but the king's mismanagement.

One cannot sympathise overmuch with Henry; he had chosen to be king and had to take the consequences. But it is only fair to say that these charges were grossly exaggerated. The business of the realm could not be conducted on the ordinary revenues of the crown. If Henry of Bolingbroke had been as thrifty as Louis XI. or Henry of Richmond, he could not have made both ends meet in such a year as 1403. The complaints of the Commons show that same ignorant impatience of all taxation in a time of great national need which we had so often to note in the times of Richard II. Elaborate modern inquiries² into the finances of the king's household seem to show that his much-abused expenditure was about £36,400 a year, and the pensions and grants of 1403-4 made some £6,000 more. Much of this money was spent on outgoings which would now be regarded as public matters and not the king's personal concerns. Even if the most grinding parsimony had been employed, there was no margin of saving to be obtained in this quarter. The wars and rebellions cut short the receipts of the crown; the operations of the French pirates in the Channel led to a heavy fall in the customs duties, which the Commons ignorantly put down to the fact that the "staple" was at Calais instead of on this side of the Channel. The rebellion of Glendower had stopped the incoming of all revenue from Wales. Many districts on the Welsh and Scottish borders pleaded entire exhaustion of their paying power, owing to the ravages of the enemy. After much recrimination between the chancellor and treasurer on the one side and the Speaker as mouthpiece of the Commons on the other, the result arrived at was that the king obtained a liberal grant, but only after he had given solemn pledges for the reformation of his household, and had covenanted to make over the grants voted to be administered by "treasurers for

¹ "Isti non inquietant Angliam multum," *Eulogium*, iii., 229.

² See Sir James Ramsay's *Lancaster and York*, i., 156-58.

CHAP. war" appointed by parliament, a device tried before during
VIII. the minority of Richard II.

The money was raised, not by tenths and fifteenths, but by a new tax, a device about which the Commons were so doubtful that they stipulated that it should not be taken as a precedent, and that all record of it should be destroyed. This was duly done, to the great hindrance of modern inquirers into the subject. The impost was a sort of property and income-tax of twenty shillings on every knight's fee, and one shilling for every pound on the annual value of lands and houses not held by military tenure. Persons not possessing real property were to be assessed, not on their income but on their capital, at the rate of one shilling for every £20 of personal property that they owned. Ecclesiastical property was to be taxed no less than lay, and the only exemptions granted were to districts on the Welsh or Scottish marches lately ravaged by the king's enemies. The whole result of the tax was to be paid not to the exchequer but to four "treasurers for war". The fact that this impost, which after all amounted to no more than an income-tax of 5 per cent. on land and a levy of 1-400 on goods, was regarded as very onerous is a sufficient proof of the fictitious nature of the normal "tenths" and "fifteenths" which the nation was accustomed to pay. Evidently a real 5 per cent. tax, *i.e.*, a "twentieth," was a much more serious matter than a nominal "tenth". The latter was already becoming a fixed and conventional sum, not a true fraction of the private wealth of the king's subjects. A "fifteenth" in Henry's reign seems to have amounted to £36,000, a "tenth" to £54,000; but what the income-tax of 1404 yielded we cannot say, owing to the careful destruction of the records. If the Commons had been pleased with the device they would have taken it into regular use; but it was never again employed, save once in 1411 when the much smaller percentage of a noble (6s. 8d.) on every £20 of rent was voted; this was a proportion of 1·6 per cent. instead of the 5 per cent. of 1404.

In return for the grant of this new tax the king was compelled to submit to a humiliating reduction of his household and a revision of his personal expenditure. He had to dismiss his confessor and other members of his court; the queen was to get rid of all her foreign servants save ten persons. Archbishop

Arundel, as representing the council, came forward to state that the expenses of the king must be restricted to a fixed sum of £12,100 a year. As the accounts of 1403 show that they had amounted in 1403 to £27,500, it was proposed to dock Henry of more than half his personal revenue at one fell swoop. But he yielded meekly, perhaps comforting himself with the reflection that such wholesale reductions would prove impossible in practice—as indeed they did. It looked as if the two houses had obtained in 1404 the practical control over the crown which they were not really to enjoy till the second half of the seventeenth century. But the “Lancastrian experiment” was not to last. A bankrupt king, in the midst of rebellions and wars, might concede much that in more quiet times his subjects could not hope to retain. But by the end of his reign, when his throne was no longer rocking under him, Henry began to resume much of the royal power that he was now granting away.

The remaining events of the spring and summer of 1404 were, save in Wales, not unsatisfactory to the king. A feeble conspiracy in Essex in favour of “King Richard,” that is, the impostor in Scotland, was detected and put down. Three separate piratical descents of the French and Bretons on the south coast were triumphantly repelled. On July 6 the Scots signed a truce for nine months, and Northumberland showed himself on his good behaviour. He gave up, as a token of his loyalty, an unfortunate conspirator who had sought refuge with him, one William Serle who had been implicated in the murder of Gloucester in 1397, and had of late been active in spreading the rumour that King Richard was still alive. Serle was duly hung at Tyburn.

Wales however remained unsubdued. In the spring Glendower captured Harlech Castle, one of the three keys of North Wales, and for the future made it his chief stronghold and the repository of his treasures. He held soon after a parliament at Machynlleth, with such state as he could command. He had a regular court about him, with chancellor, secretary, banner-bearer and marshal.¹ Four representatives of each region of Wales had been summoned to his parliament. Its proceedings are not extant, but Owen must certainly have laid before his

¹ See Adam of Usk, p. 86.

CHAP.
VIII.

adherents his great scheme for a formal alliance with France. To carry out the negotiations his chancellor, Griffin Yonge, and his brother-in-law, John Hanmer, were sent to Paris with credentials dated May 10, "in the fourth year of our principate".¹ They reached their destination in safety, and were welcomed not merely by the Orleanist party but by the whole French court. Philip Duke of Burgundy was lately dead, and Orleans, freed from his uncle's rivalry, was for the moment in complete control of his brother's councils. Accordingly the ministers of Charles VI. concluded a regular treaty with Owen's ambassadors, pledging themselves to an invasion of England and engaging to make no peace with "Henry of Lancaster" in which Wales should not be included. This was equivalent to a repudiation of the existing truce with England.

Henry made no attempt to invade Wales this year. Two small forces were kept on foot; one, at Carmarthen, under the Duke of York, late Edward of Rutland, who had succeeded his father in 1402; the other, under the Prince of Wales, at Shrewsbury. Both were in a state of mutiny on account of the arrears of their pay, and did little or nothing to restrain the activity of Glendower. At last, hopelessly impecunious once more, the king summoned a new parliament to meet at Coventry on October 6, 1404. This assembly is generally remembered as the "unlearned parliament," a term applied to it because Henry, following a precedent set by Edward III. in 1372, in his writs to the sheriffs directed them to return no members who had ever studied law or pleaded in the courts.² This can only mean that Henry had found in his previous parliaments that the leaders who raised constitutional points, and led the debates into discussions on prerogative or the old rights of the crown, were those who had received a legal education. They were also

¹ The document may be found in Rymer, viii., 356. It is dated from Dolelly.

² The phrase "*parliamentum illiteratum*" comes from the *Annales Hen. IV.*, p. 391. Otterbourn, p. 249, calls it "*parliamentum laicum*". Walsingham says, "*Direxit ergo breves Vicecomitibus ne quosquam pro comitatibus eligerent quovis modo milites qui in jure regni vel docti fuissent vel apprenticii, sed tales mitterentur quos constaret ignorare cujusque juris methodum*" (ii., 265). Clearly, then, many knights had (like Owen Glendower) been "apprenticii" at Westminster.

accused of an inveterate tendency toward promoting private suits for their own professional advantage. But though the lawyers on this occasion were absent, there was enough business talent among the "unlettered" knights to raise a long discussion about the unsatisfactory administration of the realm and its finances. They debated for thirty-eight days before they gave Henry his grant of money. The rolls of parliament are silent as to these wrangles, and we have to refer to the chronicles in order to discover their purport. The Commons were once more urging that "the king should live of his own," and to enable him to do so were prepared to advocate most drastic measures.

On October 28, after much preliminary debate, they presented a petition begging the king to "resume" all grants of lands, tenements, and pensions given since the year 1367. Then followed demands calculated to rouse even greater animosities; the knights raised the old question of disendowment of the Church, so often heard of in the early parliaments of Richard II. We must not regard this as a result of secret Lollardy, prevalent among the rural gentry; no hint to that effect is given by chroniclers who would gladly have saddled the malcontents with a charge of heresy. It was simply an anti-clerical, not a Wycliffite movement. "These knights murmured that, while they were perpetually taking the field against rebels or foreign foes, and not merely contributing their money grants, but perilling their bodies, the clergy sat safe and quiet at home, helping the king in no wise."¹ The actual proposal made in the Commons seems to have been that the crown should sequester for one year all clerical revenues, and let the clerks meanwhile live on alms as best they could. This was sweeping enough, but the monastic chroniclers enlarge it into a proposal for a permanent appropriation of all Church property, "the confiscation of Christ's patrimony throughout the whole realm".

There followed the inevitable outbreak of wrangling; Archbishop Arundel replied, with much plausibility, that the clergy were wont to grant the king a tenth when the laity grudged a fifteenth, and that the knights from the Church's fiefs were

¹ Walsingham, ii., 265.

CHAP.
VIII.

as punctual at every muster as the lay tenants-in-chief. Finally he fell down on his knees before the king, and besought him to remember his coronation oath, wherein he had sworn to maintain every man, clerk or layman, in his rightful inheritance. Then the Bishop of Rochester called for a copy of Magna Carta, read the clause concerning the liberty of the Church, and declared that those who threatened it were subject to the major excommunication. This was effective enough; but the main reason for the rejection of the knights' demand, was that most of the greater lay magnates possessed lands granted by the crown since 1367, which would be affected by the other petition of the Commons. A fellow-feeling against confiscation made them wondrous kind to the Church; they besought the king to turn a deaf ear to such proposals, and after much murmuring the scheme was dropped, and the Commons proceeded to supply. They gave two tenths and two fifteenths, prolonged the existing customs grant for three years, and renewed the income-tax granted in March—but it was to be exacted only from persons with an annual revenue of more than 500 marks.

Finally the year passed over without any of the further evils that had been feared. The French fleet dispersed after a little futile piracy in the Channel; Glendower's activity seemed somewhat to slacken, and the king spent his Christmas in comparative cheerfulness. The event that was best remembered of all the occurrences of the autumn of 1404 was the death of William of Wykeham, the great Bishop of Winchester, at the patriarchal age of eighty-two. Though an inveterate pluralist, and a man of business rather than a saint, he left his mark upon the history of his age, not so much by his honest but ineffective career as a politician and official, as by starting on a grand scale the first of the great English public schools, and linking to it the first really well-endowed and well-housed college in Oxford. He lives in men's minds as the founder of Winchester and New College, not as the chancellor of Richard II. The rich bishopric of Winchester was transferred to Henry Beaufort, whose tenure of the see of St. Swithun was to be even longer than that of Wykeham himself.¹

¹ Wykeham was consecrated October 10, 1367, and died September 27, 1404. Beaufort was translated March 14, 1405, and died April 11, 1447.

If 1404 was mainly notable in the annals of England for its two troublous parliaments, 1405 shows a far different history, one of desperate domestic treason and civil war, varied only by passages of arms with the French and Welsh. It started ill, with a plot that nearly achieved its end. The chief mover in this business was a woman, Constance of York, the widow of Thomas Despenser, Earl of Gloucester, who had perished on the block at Bristol five years before. She schemed to carry off to Wales the young Earl of March, the rightful heir of Richard II., a quiet harmless lad of twelve who was carefully kept under the king's eye at Windsor. On February 13, while staying as a guest in the castle, she procured false keys, and got access to the rooms where March and his younger brother slept. The boys were persuaded to escape, and galloped off with Lady Despenser and a handful of her retainers on the road to Wales. The king raised the hue and cry after them, and they were overtaken and captured in a wood near Cheltenham, less than thirty-six hours after their flight. On being brought before the council, the Lady Constance openly avowed her plan, adding that she had been first abetted and then betrayed by that consistent marplot, her brother Edward, Duke of York. Confronted with his sister, the duke made a sorry show, confessed that there had been a plot, and asked for pardon in consideration of the fact that he had put the king upon his sister's track, and given up the names of her accomplices. The chief person whom he had sounded was the young Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham, the son and heir of that Duke of Norfolk who had faced Henry of Lancaster in the lists at Coventry. Mowbray at once owned that York had tampered with him, but proved to the satisfaction of the council that he had refused to listen. He was acquitted, while York was sentenced to forfeiture, and imprisoned for six months, but finally pardoned. Henry perhaps thought him more useful as a wrecker of plots than dangerous as a framer of them. It is clear, however, that York only revealed part of what he knew, or had never been trusted with the whole secret, for a revolt as dangerous as that which had ended at Hatfield was on the eve of breaking out.

Before its discovery, however, Henry was cheered by some unexpected strokes of luck. Owen Glendower, for the first

CHAP. time in his career, met with two checks in the spring of 1405.
VIII. On March 11 Lord Talbot surprised and defeated the rebel army of South Wales at Grosmont in Monmouthshire. Glendower sent large reinforcements to keep up the struggle in Gwent and Glamorgan. To face them the young Henry Prince of Wales marched out from Hereford; he met them at Usk on May 5, and routed them with much slaughter. Owen's brother, Tudor, was among the slain, and Griffith, his eldest son, was captured and sent to the Tower. This was the first success of the future victor of Agincourt, who was now in his eighteenth year and beginning to act for himself. He had ripened quickly in the hard school of mountain warfare, and was already a competent soldier; ere long he was to figure as a statesman also. Only ten days after the battle of Usk came another victory; the Count of St. Pol with the levies of Picardy had beset the castle of Marck, the outlying bulwark of Calais. He was surprised in his camp by Sir Richard Aston, and discomfited with the loss of eighty men-at-arms slain and many prisoners. It was the greatest success that the English had won over the French beyond seas since the time of Edward III.

But there was short space granted the king to rejoice over these triumphs. Lady Despenser's plot to rescue the young Mortimers had only been a branch of a great scheme in which all the malcontents of the realm were joined. The central organiser was the old Earl of Northumberland, who had forgotten his gratitude for the pardon of 1403, and was set on revenge. Emissaries from Glendower had been hiding in his castles during the winter, and he was bargaining with Sir James Douglas, the brother of the captive Earl Archibald, for Scottish aid. He was also in communication with all the discontented magnates of England; of these the chief were Richard Scrope, Archbishop of York, Lord Bardolph, Sir Eudo Welles, the Abbot of Welbeck and, most important of all, the young Earl of Nottingham, that same Thomas Mowbray whom the Duke of York had tempted in the spring. The Earl Marshal's motives are easy to understand—he inherited his father's hatred for the house of Lancaster; the archbishop's are more obscure. He had an unblemished record, was universally esteemed for his piety and blameless life, and was

much beloved in the north. He may have nourished a grudge for the death of his cousin Scrope, Earl of Wiltshire, in 1399; but if so he had concealed it for many years, and had always passed as a loyal adherent of King Henry. If we may trust the manifesto which he issued at the moment of his rising, he was a disappointed lover of the constitution, who was shocked at the thriftless governance of the realm. The absence of private motives for his action is so complete that we may perhaps accept his plea, and believe that he had been lured by Northumberland to lend his aid to a mere baronial revolt, under the idea that he was serving the best interests of the realm. Bardolph, like the archbishop, had been a Lancastrian from the first; he was a member of the privy council, and had been prominent of late as an advocate of economy and a critic of the king's administration. Whether he was a misguided constitutional reformer, or merely an ambitious baron, it is impossible to say. But it is certain that to Northumberland at least the rebellion was but the means for restoring the supremacy of the house of Percy in the north, and avenging Hatley Field.

Henry, who was just about to set out for a campaign in Wales, lay at Derby on May 28, 1405, when he received the unwelcome news that all the northern counties were up in arms. Northumberland had started operations by an attempt to seize and slay Westmorland, the rival who held the position which he had forfeited by his rebellion in 1403. Earl Ralph had escaped, and was trying to collect a loyalist force in Yorkshire. Meanwhile Archbishop Scrope and Mowbray entered York with a great following, called the citizens to arms, and posted up a long manifesto on the doors of the minster. It accused the king of thriftless governance, extortionate multiplication of taxes, and tyrannical oppression. It was his fault that Wales was unsubdued and that French pirates swarmed in the Channel. The archbishop and the earl avowed that they had only taken arms in order that they might be able to petition for redress in safety: if they had come before their master without a strong guard, he would have imprisoned them as movers of sedition. No mention is made in the manifesto of the rights of the Mor-

CHAP. VIII. timers or the deposition of the king ; the petitioners pose merely as constitutional reformers.¹

When Scrope gave the signal all Yorkshire rose : the North and West Ridings were almost unanimous in their disloyalty. An army gathered round York, while independent bands appeared in Cleveland and on the western moors. If the rebellion had been given three weeks to develop, it is possible that it might have ended in the deposition of Henry IV. But it was wrecked at the outset by the prompt action of one faithful and unscrupulous supporter of the king. The Earl of Westmorland, after escaping from Percy's snares, had collected his own tenants and the few other loyalists of the north ; he was joined also by the king's third son, John, now warden of the east march of Scotland. He led his small force directly against York, and on May 27-29 was facing the insurgent army on Shipton Moor, six miles north-west of the city. Too weak to take the offensive, he entrenched himself, and waited to be attacked : meanwhile he sent a formal summons to ask why the archbishop and the earl marshal were in arms against their king. They replied by sending him a copy of their manifesto : Westmorland observed that it seemed to contain much weighty and laudable matter, and asked them to come out and talk it over with him. Scrope, confident apparently in his good intentions, fell into the trap, and prevailed on Mowbray to join him in a conference with the earl. They met Westmorland and Prince John in an open space between the two camps, each party bringing only three knights and a few archers as guard. The interview opened in the most friendly fashion, and the rebel chiefs were as astonished as they were delighted by Westmorland's pretended sympathy for their grievances. But while they were drinking a cup of wine with each other in pledge of their reconciliation, an armed party, which Westmorland had hidden close by, ran in and arrested Scrope and Mowbray as traitors. At the same moment the royalist army, which had been secretly getting into array, charged down hill into the camp of the insurgents, of whom all were unarmed and many scattered in search of food. There

¹ So the document given in *Annales Hen. IV.*, pp. 403-4, and Walsingham. There is a very different one in *Anglia Sacra*, ii., 362, which is probably not genuine. See Wylie, ii., 214 f.

was no bloodshed: the astonished Yorkshiremen were beaten off with staves, and fled. CHAP. VIII.

After this unknightly act of treachery, Westmorland placed his prisoners in Pontefract Castle, and marched north to face the Percies, who were coming with a great force to join the archbishop. On hearing of what had happened, Northumberland and Bardolph halted in indecision near Durham. Thus the king had time to come up before any battle had taken place. He arrived at Pontefract on June 3 in a frenzy of wrath, and showed a wild haste in revenge that he had never before displayed. He had sworn that the archbishop and the earl marshal should lose their heads. He took them on with him to York, and there ordered his chief justice, Sir William Gascoigne, to try them at once as traitors. The worthy judge declared that he would not venture to condemn either a prelate or an earl. Thereupon the king sent them before a hastily appointed commission, consisting of the Earls of Arundel and Warwick, four other peers, and three or four puisne judges, who sat in the banqueting hall of Scrope's own palace of Bishopthorpe on June 8, 1405.

At this moment there arrived on the scene Archbishop Arundel, who had ridden day and night to join the king, because he heard that Scrope's head was in danger. He urged that it would be sacrilegious to slay a primate with the secular axe, reminded the king of the ills that had fallen on Henry II. from the death of Becket, and begged him to leave the punishment of Scrope to the pope or at least to the house of lords. Henry behaved with consummate dissimulation; he owned that there was much in Arundel's arguments, and said he would hear him again, when he should have rested after his long ride. While Arundel slept, the trial of Scrope and Mowbray was hurried over with scandalous haste and informality. They were arraigned and condemned off-hand, without any production of evidence or space given for defence. Justice Fulthorpe, in the name of the whole commission, pronounced them rebels taken in arms, and sentenced them to be beheaded that same morning. Without delay the prisoners were hurried off for execution to a field outside the Skeldergate, one of the posterns of York. The young earl marshal showed signs of breaking down, but the archbishop

CHAP.
VIII.

bade him be of good courage, for he had been unjustly condemned and was dying for the right. Before he knelt down at the block on which Mowbray had already suffered, Scrope called all men to witness that he perished for the sake of the laws and liberties of England.

This execution did Henry IV. much harm. The Yorkshiremen, great and small, made no doubt that Scrope had been labouring for a just cause when he fell. They proclaimed him a martyr as undoubted as Becket, and he had hardly been buried in the minster ere miracles began to be worked over his grave. So great was the throng around it, that the king had to order a scaffolding of wood to be built over the spot, and guards placed there to turn away the would-be worshippers. It was a case of

De par le roi, defence à dieu
De faire miracle dans ce lieu,

as the French satirist wrote in a similar case long generations after.¹ Nor was it only the Yorkshiremen who were shocked. Archbishop Arundel was so disgusted at the way in which he had been tricked, that he took to his bed and nearly died of sorrow. His relations with his master were never again so cordial as they had been in earlier years. The pope excommunicated those responsible for Scrope's death, though without naming the king among them. There is good reason to believe that the story which told how Henry himself was overcome by panic-fear and remorse, when he reflected on what he had done, has some foundation. As he marched north against the Percies he was stricken down by a sharp illness and had to rest seven days at Ripon. It is said that his affliction started with a horrible dream, which came to him after he had ridden for many hours in the blinding rain; he woke screaming that fire had been thrown over his face, and was taken next day with an eruption which was the first premonition of the dreadful skin disease that made his latter years miserable. It was whispered among his courtiers that he had seen the martyred archbishop in a vision, and had been warned that God had cast the leprosy upon him, as a punishment for his merciless

¹ Scrope was regularly worshipped as a saint in later years. His grave was covered with rich offerings, and a service in his honour as a martyr was compiled. A fragment of it exists in the Bodleian Library.

doings. Be this as it may, the king was no sooner able to move than he advanced into the north with his own levies and those which Westmorland had already collected at Durham. Northumberland dared not fight such a great host, and retired to Berwick with 300 horse, after throwing large garrisons into his chief castles. But each place capitulated when the royalist army levelled its artillery against its walls. By July 14 they were all in the king's hands. A series of executions followed; many Yorkshire and Northumbrian knights and at least one priest were beheaded between July 12 and 20.

The year's troubles were not over; there remained the old Welsh problem. The two defeats in the spring had not weakened Owen's power in North Wales, though they had checked his advance in the south. He held his second and last parliament this summer in the newly captured castle of Harlech, with undiminished state. In the autumn he received the aid from France which had been promised him at the time of the treaty of 1404. A fleet from Brest carrying 800 men-at-arms and 1,800 infantry, under the marshal Jean de Rieux and Jean de Hangeſt, grandmaster of the crossbows, reached Milford Haven in August. They sacked Haverfordwest, and were beleaguering Tenby when an English squadron, under Lord Berkeley, came in sight and fell upon their vessels as they lay at anchor. Fifteen were sunk or burnt, though the crews escaped to shore. The French were forced to throw themselves on Glendower's hospitality. He came down to join them with 10,000 men, and with their aid captured Carmarthen. He then marched with his allies into Glamorganshire, wasting all the districts which had submitted to the English after the combats of Grosmont and Usk.

This news called down King Henry from the north. He marched from Pontefract to Worcester, where the levies of the midland counties were ordered to join him. From thence he advanced with a large army to Hereford, where he was detained for several days by his usual lack of ready money to feed and equip his forces. On September 10 he was at last able to advance into Glamorganshire in search of Glendower and the French. But no good came from the expedition, save the relief of Coity or Bridgend Castle. The Franco-Welsh army seems to have taken up a strong position on the hills, and to have defied

CHAP.
VIII.

the king to attack it. For eight days the two hosts skirmished perpetually. Henry then drew off, his army having been reduced to desperate straits by incessant rain and lack of provisions. During the retreat, part of the baggage train, including the waggon with the king's crown and wardrobe, was cut off and captured by the Welsh. But there was little pursuit, the enemy being almost as famished as the English. The French knights found themselves useless and helpless among the ravines and defiles, and failed to understand the cautious tactics of Glendower. They were eager to get home, and most of the men-at-arms sailed for Brittany in November in such ships as they could procure. The infantry were left behind for want of transport, but got off next spring, profoundly disgusted with the hard life, and the diet of mutton and barley bread which was all that the Welsh could give them. The result of this autumn campaign of 1405 was most disheartening to the rebels; Glendower had long been encouraging them by the promise of French aid, yet when it came it had proved wholly ineffective.

Meanwhile the French had been active beyond seas also; but Guienne held its own fairly well. The Counts of Clermont, Armagnac and Foix beset its borders both in 1404 and 1405, and captured, after sieges of greater or less duration, several of its outlying castles and towns, such as Aiguillon, Bazas, and Mortagne. But they made no serious attempt to deal with Bordeaux or Bayonne, or their outer rings of protective fortresses—Bourg, Blaye, Liborne, Dax, Mauléon and the rest. King Henry spent the winter of 1405-6 in great disease both of mind and body. Though he had crushed the Yorkshire rising and chased Northumberland out of the realm, he had failed as badly as ever in Wales, his health was beginning to break, and he was in financial distress. There was also the serious quarrel on hand with the pope, concerning the death of the Archbishop of York. One of the contemporary chronicles tells how Henry, excusing his conduct, sent to Innocent VII. Scrope's mail-shirt, with the query, "Is this thy son's coat or no?" The pontiff, catching up the context is said to have replied, "At any rate, an evil beast has devoured him". But the tale is told also of an earlier pope and an earlier king. The dispute was only settled, after much wrangling, with Innocent's successor, who withdrew the

excommunication, after having extorted from Henry some pieces of preferment and other valuable concessions.

An eye had always to be kept on the exiled Northumberland. After a stay of a few months in Scotland the old earl removed to Wales, and abode some time at Glendower's court, endeavouring to knit up old ties with the malcontents of the English midlands through the friends of Mortimer. From this stay of the earl's in Wales dates a curious document, signed at Aberdaron on February 28, 1406.¹ It was no less than a tripartite convention for the division of England. With preposterous confidence, the high contracting parties agree that Owen shall take all Wales and England as far as the Severn and Mersey, while Northumberland is to get not only the north but the midlands, so far as Worcester, Northampton, and Norwich. London and the south, together with the kingly title, are to go to the Mortimers, *i.e.*, to Sir Edmund and his young nephew of March, for whom he would naturally act as regent. The document must have been dictated by Owen in one of his moments of grandiose dreaming: it purports to be drawn up "in consonance with the ancient prophecies". Not long after the earl took his departure to Paris to see what could be accomplished in that direction.

On the day after the convention of Aberdaron was signed, King Henry met at Westminster the longest and not the least contentious parliament of his reign. It sat for no less than 158 business days, between March 1 and December 22, allowing for two breaks for the Easter and Midsummer vacations. The chancellor, whose speech opened the proceedings, was Thomas Langley, Dean of York, for Bishop Beaufort had laid down the seals on being translated to Winchester in the preceding year. The "long parliament" went over once more the same old round of grievances that had been discussed at each one of the preceding parliaments of the reign. The Commons told their master that they wanted more "good governance abounding," that they were vexed at the continuance of Glendower's rebellion, and shamed by the prevalence of French piracy in the Channel. They wanted to know why the garrison of Calais

¹ Though some chronicles ascribe this treaty to 1405, there can be no doubt that Mr. Wylie is right in ascribing it to 1406, the only year in which Northumberland can have been at Aberdaron (*Henry IV.*, ii., 379).

CHAP.
VIII.

was below strength, why the accounts of the war treasurers appointed in the parliament of 1404 were still unaudited, why the queen was still allowed to keep many foreign servants and retainers about her. They spoke, we are told, concerning the king in terms that were most unbecoming; they even told him to his face that his expensive household was composed "not of valiant and sufficient persons, but of rascally,"¹ a term of absurd exaggeration which recalls all the extravagant language used a few years back concerning the retainers of the unfortunate Richard II. All this heckling and nagging was borne by Henry with exemplary patience. He wanted subsidies, and in the hope of getting them he was ready to endure any amount of hard words, and to promise any measures, possible or impossible, of reform. It would seem that he was in a state of great bodily weakness; the illness which had fallen upon him in the previous June, after Scrope's death, was now again troubling him, and in April actually disabled him for a time from work. Growing infirmity may account for the way in which he bore insults without showing any sign of resentment, and acquiesced in every petition that was laid before him.

The main scheme which the Commons were anxious to urge upon him was a very unwise one. The ravages of French pirates in the Channel were to be checked not by raising a permanent war-navy, but by subsidising the merchants of England to defend themselves. An association of shipowners was formed, who undertook to keep on foot 2,000 armed men; every vessel was to sail either under convoy or with a band of trained soldiers on board. In return the association was to receive the proceeds of tunnage and poundage during the term of their contract, as also a fourth of the subsidy that had been voted by the "unlearned parliament" in 1404, and a lump sum of £4,000 for preliminary expenses. This plan was unsound in principle, and turned out unsatisfactory in practice. No nation acts wisely in handing over the defence of the sea to privateers, who are naturally bent on making prizes, rather than on serving the high strategical needs of the state. As to the Welsh war, the houses petitioned the king to unify all the operations against Glendower by appointing Prince Henry lieutenant of South as well as of North Wales, and entrusting

¹ *Rot. Parl.*, iii., 577.

him with a larger permanent force, 1,100 men-at-arms and 3,800 archers. The competence and activity of the heir apparent were beginning to be recognised in all quarters. His first victory at Usk in 1405, had been followed by another on October 21, wherein he had captured Owen's chancellor and secretary, and his brother-in-Law, John Hanmer, and dispersed their whole army, the last which attempted to dispute in the open field the mastery of South Wales. By Eastertide the king found that, in spite of the many concessions he had made to the parliament, he had not yet been granted the supplies for which he yearned. He dismissed the houses for a three weeks' recess, after giving them to understand that he hoped their purse-strings might be opened in May, without any further discussion of grievances.

But meanwhile, though he had got nothing as yet from parliament, a great piece of good fortune had been thrown into his lap by mere chance. King Robert III. of Scotland was nearing his end; he had always been a helpless invalid, the victim of ambitious relatives and turbulent barons. His eldest son had been seized, imprisoned, and probably starved to death in 1403; he feared a similar fate for James, his other child, and resolved to put him out of the reach of Albany and the Douglasses, by sending him overseas ere he himself should die. His design was to entrust him to the friendly court of France, where he might be reared till he reached the age of manhood, and was able to defend his own cause. Accordingly he sent the lad off from the fortress of the Bass in charge of the Earl of Orkney. But off Flamborough Head his ship was stopped by some privateers belonging to the port of Cley in Norfolk, who learning the importance of the persons on board, arrested them and sent them off to the king on March 30, 1406. Henry was stirred to mirth, even in the midst of his trouble and sickness, by the arrival of the captives. When he was told how the young prince had been sent to be reared at the court of Charles VI. he is said to have exclaimed, "The Scots might have sent me the lad to teach and train, for I know French well enough". And an English training was indeed to be the lot of James Stewart. But it was bought by seventeen years of captivity that was irksome at the best, though the prisoner was treated with all honour, was allowed to ride and hunt and

CHAP.
VIII.

shoot, was moved frequently from one royal castle or manor to another, had much intercourse with the younger members of the royal family, and was taught by wise masters who made him one of the most accomplished princes of his day. We know from his own poems that he was sick to death of the castle walls that he might not pass save under a guard, and had many black days in which his books, his bow, and his harp all failed to comfort him.

Only five days after his son's capture King Robert III. expired. His death put Henry in a favourable position for dealing with the Scots. He could always bring pressure to bear on the Regent Albany, by threatening to let his captive loose—the last thing that the duke desired, for an absent sovereign suited him well. On the other hand he might, if occasion required, negotiate with the party in Scotland which hated Albany, and offer them the prince as a leader. Finally, if ever James were released, a large ransom could be claimed for him. For the rest of Henry's reign, indeed, the Scottish problem was far less pressing than it had been in his earlier years. As for the morality of the king's dealings with the Scottish prince there is not much to be said. There was a paper truce in existence between England and Scotland at the moment when James was captured, though it was about to expire in a few days. It had not been properly kept; during the last autumn the Earl of Mar, brother of Robert III., had been lying off the Northumbrian coast and intercepting all ships bound for Newcastle. On the other hand, the Scots complained that English pirates or privateers had raided Whithorn in June, 1405, and plundered the Isle of Arran. Clearly both parties had broken the truce, though neither had formally denounced it. A prince with a high ideal of knightly honour might have dismissed James Stewart. Henry IV. was not such a person, and retained him in ward, with the full approval of his subjects.

In May parliament reassembled, and found the king disabled by disease. He was confined to his chamber, and hardly able to discharge the simplest business. This encouraged the Commons to continue harping on grievances instead of proceeding to supply. A fortnight later the king had become so ill that he made over to his council the greater

part of the functions of royalty, reserving only the right of pardoning condemned persons and filling vacant offices. It was with the council, therefore, that the Commons had now to deal, and Archbishop Arundel, as its senior member, conducted the haggling over grants and petitions which filled the next month. Naturally the councillors cared less about royal prerogative than their master. They consented that commissioners should draw up a list of all royal grants that had been made since the death of Richard II., with a view to resumption. Another commission was to examine the receipts of all sheriffs, coroners, custom-house officers, and other royal officials. It was conceded that the budget of the war treasurers appointed in 1404 should be thoroughly audited, "though kings were not wont to render accounts," as Arundel plaintively remarked. Some members of the royal household were dismissed, and the queen's Breton servants were sent home. In return for all this the Commons only granted an extra shilling of customs dues on each pound's worth of produce imported by foreigners, and gave the king leave to use one-third of the subsidy on wool for his private expenses. They gratified him, however, by passing a bill regulating the succession on June 7. It provided that the crown should pass in the male line, and that only if all the king's four sons should die without male heirs were daughters to be taken into consideration. Under such a rule of succession Henry himself would be the lawful successor of Richard II., the issue of Lionel of Clarence's daughter being ruled out in favour of John of Gaunt's son.

Henry, somewhat recovered from his illness, devoted the greater part of the summer recess to providing for the marriage of his second daughter, Philippa, to Eric of Pomerania, the heir of the great Queen Margaret, who by the Union of Calmar had become the ruler of the three Scandinavian kingdoms. So penniless, however, was Henry, that to provide the princess' trousseau and escort he had to borrow £6,000 from Richard Whittington, the famous mayor of London, and smaller sums from Archbishop Arundel and other lenders. Philippa sailed from Lynn in August, destined to a most unhappy life with a husband who was a coward and an evil liver, and ultimately fooled away the three northern crowns which his great-aunt had so laboriously united.

CHAP.
VIII.

There was little at this moment to distract Henry's attention from his daughter's marriage. The danger in Wales was slowly beginning to wane; another defeat had been inflicted on the rebels by Prince Henry on April 23; in it one of Glendower's younger sons—we know not whether it was Madoc, or John, or Thomas—had been slain. Nor had Owen got any profit from an attempt to sever the Welsh Church more completely from the English domination. He had acknowledged the anti-Pope Benedict XIII., and had sent to Avignon for a bull removing the Welsh dioceses from the province of Canterbury, and giving them a metropolitan of their own at St. Davids. But it only created divisions among the rebels, for not all even among the native Welsh clergy were prepared to renounce the Roman obedience in favour of the French schism. The clearest sign of Owen's failing power is the number of pardons issued to Welsh rebels in 1406. They were very numerous in Gwent and Glamorgan; and in Anglesea it would seem that the whole shire submitted in a body during the autumn, for a single document, dated November 9, records that 2,112 inhabitants of the island were admitted to grace on paying fines ranging up from two shillings to twelve marks a head. All accounts agree that the unceasing activity of Henry Prince of Wales was the chief factor in the steady progress made by the English arms.

In France, the main quarter from which danger threatened King Henry, the growing bitterness of the feud between John of Burgundy and Louis of Orleans, gave good promise of quiet in the future, though one more great effort was about to be made against England, ere the two factions finally turned aside from foreign war to devote their whole attention to destroying each other. In the month of September Orleans and Burgundy, after a hollow reconciliation, agreed to display their patriotism by making a simultaneous assault on the national enemy. Burgundy undertook to besiege Calais, Orleans to march against Bordeaux. But Duke John tarried so long collecting stores and siege engines that he only reached Calais in November, and after lying before the place only fifteen days was driven off by torrential rains and wintry cold. Orleans had started earlier; his main objective was Bourq, one of the two great fortresses on the Gironde which serve as the

outworks of Bordeaux. But the place, held by a garrison of loyal Gascon men-at-arms and repeatedly succoured by English ships, maintained a desperate defence. Orleans lay before it for ten weeks, breached its walls, and delivered several unsuccessful assaults. But his army gradually melted away from cold and dysentery, and on January 14 he abandoned his trenches and led off his shattered bands to winter quarters. This was his last campaign : in the next year he was to fall beneath the daggers of assassins hired by Burgundy.

CHAP.
VIII.

The French invasion of Guienne had begun and the siege of Calais was impending, when the "long parliament" met for its third session on October 18. The danger to the king's possessions beyond seas disposed the Commons to make more liberal grants than they had promised in the summer. But the needs of the war did not distract them from their programme of retrenchment and reform. They began by rescinding the contract with the association of merchants who had undertaken to keep the narrow seas ; the plan had proved unworkable. Another act of the late session was also reversed—that which settled the succession to the crown on males alone. It was now enacted that if the Prince of Wales should have daughters, but no son, they should duly succeed before their uncles Thomas, John, and Humphrey. Possibly the elder brother had been pressing his father not to disinherit his hypothetical daughters for the profit of his brother Thomas, with whom he does not seem at this moment to have been on good terms.

But these matters were of small importance compared with the great scheme of constitutional reform which was produced as the final result of the three protracted sessions of the "long parliament". It consisted of thirty-one articles, to which the king gave his assent with manifest reluctance. The chief clauses of this document were as follows. The king was to do nothing without the consent of the "continual council" of seventeen, which he had nominated in May. He was to devote two days of every week to public business, on which he was to submit everything to the members of the council, and to give no decision without their approval ; legal points were to be referred to the bench of judges. Neither the king nor the queen were to interfere personally in any quarrels or lawsuits of private

CHAP.
VIII.

persons, so as to influence the course of justice. Sheriffs, escheators, and other officers were to be appointed not by the king's private choice, but by the king sitting in council. No grants or alienations of royal property were to be made without the knowledge and consent of the councillors. To prevent the packing of parliaments by the sheriffs, acting under secret orders from the king, notice of elections was to be published at least fifteen days before the day of the return. All this, when taken in connexion with the concessions made by Henry to his earlier parliaments, amounted to nothing less than the supersession of the crown as the executive of the realm, and the substitution for it of a sort of ministry dependent on the two houses. It is true that the arrangement was to endure only till the next parliament should meet. But as a precedent it seemed destined to govern the administration of the realm for many a year. Unless Henry should be restored to health, and all the external and internal troubles of England should vanish away, so that the sovereign might really be enabled to "live of his own" without any need for grants from the Commons, it looked as if the constitutional change would be permanent.

Only one more act of the "long parliament" requires notice. This was a measure against Lollardy, passed, as we are told, at the special instance of the Prince of Wales and the lords spiritual and temporal. The younger Henry now appears for the first time in the character of champion of orthodoxy which he so much affected in his later years, but probably Archbishop Arundel was mainly responsible, now as in 1401, for the harrying of the heretics. For in the wording of the act we find much made of his favourite argument, by which he had silenced the friends of disendowment in the "Unlearned Parliament," that Lollardy was an anti-social movement, which began by protesting against the holding of property by the Church, but ended in denying all rights of property whatever, so that it was as dangerous to the lay landholder as to the cleric. The Lollards were also accused of spreading the long-discredited rumour that King Richard was still alive, and of preparing men's minds for rebellion. They may have done so; but it will be remembered that the last persons convicted of this offence were their old enemies the mendicant friars, of whom so many suffered on the gallows in 1403. Such reports were circulated by all malcon-

tents, whatever their religious views. After thus stigmatising the poor heretics as dangerous to the state no less than to the Church, the act directs all sheriffs, lords of franchises, and legal officials to arrest as public enemies any man or woman detected in teaching or defending any Lollard doctrine.

CHAP.
VIII.

From the moment when King Henry humbled himself to submit to the "thirty-one articles" his political situation began to improve. The incessant activity of his eldest son had reduced all South Wales to some show of obedience. Even the rugged Cardiganshire had been invaded, and an English garrison re-established at Lampeter. In July a serious endeavour was made to break into North Wales, where Owen's domination had not been disputed for the last four years. The prince, advancing from the south, laid siege to Aberystwith, the fortress which blocks the road along the sea-coast into Merionethshire. His force of 600 men-at-arms and 1,800 archers was not large, but, for a marvel, it was paid with regularity, and had been furnished with a considerable train of artillery shipped round from Bristol. Yet it would seem that starvation rather than villainous saltpetre ultimately brought the garrison to terms. On September 12 the castellan, Rhys ap Griffith, agreed to surrender the place, unless Glendower himself should appear and drive off the besieging army before November 1. Believing that the rebels would never risk a battle, the prince returned to Hereford with part of his force, leaving the rest, under the Duke of York, to blockade the castle. He had underrated his adversary; somewhere in the middle of October, Glendower pierced the English lines and entered Aberystwith. He deposed the castellan as a traitor, and threw in a new garrison, pledged to hold out till the last extremity. Thereupon York, whose troops had begun to desert as soon as they saw a winter siege impending, drew off and marched back to Hereford. The advance into North Wales had to be postponed till the next year.

A clear sign of the growing tranquillity of the realm in 1407-8 is the fact that for the first time for many years the English chroniclers begin to show an interest in the progress of the Great Schism. Now there seemed some chance that the breach in the western Church might be healed. The French government was ready to disavow the anti-pope at Avignon, if other powers would bring similar pressure to bear on the

CHAP. Roman pontiff. In this bargain the government of England
VIII. showed a readiness to concur ; and it was wrongly believed that both Benedict of Avignon and Gregory of Rome would resign in the ensuing spring ; they had, however, no such intention, and wore out the patience of their followers by finding endless excuses for delay.

But the reunion of the Church was still supposed to be near at hand when, on October 20, 1407, King Henry met his seventh parliament at Gloucester. Archbishop Arundel, now chancellor again for the fourth time, was able to give a fairly good account of his administration. The council appointed by the "long parliament" to discharge the royal functions had met with comparatively smooth times, though they had not quite succeeded in making revenue and expenditure balance, and were still somewhat in debt. When the Speaker, Thomas Chaucer, member for Oxfordshire, and son of the poet Geoffrey, began to criticise their expenditure, Arundel replied that he and his colleagues would be only too happy to resign, whereupon Chaucer had to answer that the Commons desired nothing of the kind, and were desirous that the present arrangement should continue, a kind of testimonial which governments of that age seldom received. The most important constitutional point raised during this session was a question as to the form in which supply ought to be granted. The king, after conferring with the council and the house of lords, suggested that a grant of three twentieths and a tenth was required. The Commons took this suggestion as an infringement of the doctrine that all money grants ought to originate in the lower house. If the king and lords were to adopt the habit of calculating the amount of revenue required, and requesting the Commons to contribute precisely that sum, the freedom of discussing supply would be gone. Accordingly they "professed themselves greatly disturbed, saying and affirming that this was in great prejudice and derogation of their liberties". The king hastened to reassure them ; he explained that he never wished to have any estimate or report of financial grants made to him which had not been discussed and duly passed by the lower house. "A grant should be made by the Commons and assented to by the Lords, and the report should always be made through the Speaker." This

was all that could be desired, and the Commons now that they were certain that the precedent would not be abused, showed their gratitude by giving the king precisely the amount that he had originally asked. Henry in return assured them of his entire affection, and promised that, after the liberal grant now received, he would ask for no more taxation till Easter, 1410. He was fortunate enough to be able to redeem this pledge; his days of trouble were passing away, and he did not, as a matter of fact, need to call another parliament till January 27, 1410.

One great advance towards a satisfactory settlement of foreign affairs was reported by the chancellor before the two houses dispersed on December 22. The French government had signed a long and satisfactory truce, embracing both Calais and Guienne. This was a consequence of the embittered state of factions beyond the Channel. On November 23 Duke Louis was assassinated by the emissaries of Duke John. The two princes had been "reconciled" for the last time only a few days before, and had partaken of the communion together on the Sunday immediately preceding the murder. Burgundy fled to Flanders, and plainly avowed his responsibility for the crime, when he was safe in his own dominions. Seeing that open civil war was now inevitable, the French council were anxious for a truce with England, and signed a suspension of arms on December 7.

The winter of 1407-8 was one of exceptional severity; in the long snow which lay unmelted from December till the middle of March "almost the whole race of blackbirds and thrushes perished". Nevertheless, ere the snow was gone, the last battle which England was destined to see for more than forty years had been fought and won. Since 1405 the old Earl of Northumberland and his companion Lord Bardolph had been wandering from Scotland to Wales, from Wales to France, from France to Flanders, and, finally, had returned to Scotland. They resolved to try one last raid into England with their own unassisted resources, since aid from France was no longer to be hoped for. After sending emissaries all round Northumberland and Yorkshire to stir up their friends, they crossed the Tweed at the end of January, 1408, with a handful of Scottish auxiliaries, and pushed forward to Thirsk, where they raised their

CHAP.
VIII.

banners and issued a manifesto against the king. They were joined by Lewis Bifort, Glendower's Bishop of Bangor, the Abbot of Hailes, the Prior of Hexham, and a certain number of northern gentry: the list shows more Yorkshire than Northumbrian names. In the bitter February weather the muster never grew to any great strength. To meet this unexpected raid Sir Thomas Rokeby, the sheriff of Yorkshire, called out the levy of the county, and was joined by the local loyalists. He had but a small force, but it probably exceeded that of Northumberland. Marching to meet the enemy, he took post behind the Nidd at Grimbald's bridge, near Knaresborough, and there repulsed their attempt to cross the river. The insurgents turned aside and passed lower down, reaching Wetherby on February 18. On the following day they occupied Tadcaster, and then, learning that the sheriff was in close pursuit, offered him battle on Bramham Moor, close above the town. Rokeby without hesitation fell upon the rebels late in the day, and after a short but sharp skirmish among the snowdrifts and the furze was completely victorious. Northumberland was slain; Bardolph, mortally wounded, was captured, and died ere night. The Bishop of Bangor, the Prior of Hexham, and the Abbot of Hailes, with many more, were taken prisoners.

With the death of the unquiet and rancorous old earl sedition in England came to an end. The king went north as far as Pontefract and York in March, and saw to the punishment of the surviving rebels. The Abbot of Hailes was hanged with certain others, but the bishop and prior were merely imprisoned, and ultimately pardoned. The king's visit to the north, though it had been conducted at a leisurely pace, seems to have tried his waning strength overmuch. He returned by slow stages to London, and shortly after took to his bed at Archbishop Arundel's manor of Mortlake, "where he fell into an ecstasy," that is, became delirious or unconscious. His sons were hastily sent for, but, when he was believed to be at the point of death, he unexpectedly rallied, and in a few weeks was able to resume the limited part in public business which was now his share. His temporary disablement had caused no inconvenience: the days were over when his personal presence was necessary in one corner of the realm after another if the crown was to be kept safe upon his brow. The year 1408 was

one of steady growth towards quiet and prosperity ; even a poor harvest, which raised the price of wheat to a dangerous height in the autumn, caused no political disturbances. The most cheerful feature of the time was the notable diminution of the strength of Glendower's rebellion, and the gradual advance of the royal forces into those districts of North Wales where the English banner had not been seen since the king's expedition to Bangor and Strata Florida in 1401. The Prince of Wales set out in June, with a considerable army and a battering train of artillery. He laid siege both to Aberystwith and to Harlech, the two great fortresses which still remained in Glendower's hands. Both leaguers were protracted to an inordinate length, but the prince refused to be moved from them either by the approach of winter or by raids on his lines of communication. Aberystwith finally surrendered about Christmas ; Harlech held out six weeks longer : here the castellan was Sir Edmund Mortimer, who had everything to fear if he yielded. Moreover, he had with him his wife, Owen's daughter, his four children, as well as his mother-in-law, and such treasure and equipment as the rebel chief still owned. Secure in his cliff-girt castle, he defied the efforts of Henry's artillery and many attempts to mine and storm his outer works. But starvation and the winter cold were finally fatal to him : he died of exhaustion, apparently late in January, 1409, and when he was gone the garrison yielded. The ladies and children, for whom he had fought so obstinately, were sent as prisoners to London, where Edmund's little son, Lionel, and two of his three daughters died shortly after, probably in consequence of the privations they had undergone.

CHAPTER IX.

THE LAST YEARS OF HENRY IV.

CHAP. IX. THE year 1408, marked with the names of Bramham Moor and Aberystwith, may be reckoned as the end of the first period of King Henry's reign, the time of domestic troubles and foreign wars. For the remaining five years of his life his main distraction was to be the strife of his kinsmen over his sick-bed for the great offices of state. Just as the political horizon cleared, Henry had lost completely the physical capacity to profit by his good fortune. He was now a mere invalid, affected, as it would seem, by a complication of disorders. The most obvious was a distressing skin affection, which contemporary writers called leprosy, though it would seem in reality to have been something less terrible. His face was usually covered with boils or sores, especially the upper lip and the parts about the nose, and his hands were also affected. Another and a more debilitating feature of Henry's long sickness was an intermittent fever, which from time to time would keep him bed-ridden and racked with aches for weeks at a time, and would then pass off and allow him to ride, or even to hunt. But for the last five years of his life his journeys were restricted to a radius of not more than four or five days' ride from London; they lie in a circle of which Oakham, Leicester, Kenilworth, Woodstock, Romsey, and Canterbury are points on the circumference. The circle became smaller as the years went on, and in the twelvemonth which preceded his death Canterbury and Windsor were the limits of his travel.

Meanwhile domestic politics were growing simpler every month. There had come an end to Glendower's dream of maintaining himself as an independent sovereign in North Wales. He had no more castles left, and was cut off from the

chance of French aid. His wife and his eldest son were prisoners in London: another son had fallen in battle; his more prudent and half-hearted followers had deserted him. The chronicler Adam of Usk, who was lurking with him in the hills in 1409-10, tells how he "lay hid in caves and thickets, sorely tormented with many and great perils of death, and capture, and false brethren, and of hunger and thirst, and passing many nights without sleep for fear of the attacks of his foes". Nevertheless he refused to yield, even when pardon was offered him. For five years more he survived as an outlaw, hunted over every mountain side in Carnarvonshire, Merioneth, and Powys, yet never captured. From 1409 onwards he had ceased to be a public danger, and had dwindled into a local terror of the lords marchers, whose estates he continued to ravage down to the day of his death. From 1409 onwards Henry Prince of Wales, instead of spending all his time in repressing the inroads of the great outlaw, was able to turn his attention to problems concerning the governance of England.

The politics of the period 1409-13 seem mainly to have turned on the struggle of two parties for dominance in the royal council. The king let them strive, only asserting himself now and then, in one of his less and less frequent intervals of convalescence. The details of the struggle, ignored for the most part by the chroniclers, must be deduced, with much uncertainty and hesitation, from the journals of the privy council, the lists of officials and ministers made and unmade each year, and the varying lines of policy taken up and laid down according as one faction or another was predominant at the council board. At the head of one party was the Prince of Wales and his three half-uncles the Beauforts. The other was led by the old Archbishop Arundel and, at least in 1411-12, by the king's second son, Thomas, who appears not to have been on good terms with his elder brother, and certainly had a quarrel with the Beauforts. It does not seem possible to discover any great difference between the constitutional views of the two factions, though the Prince of Wales and his friends may have been somewhat less inclined than were their rivals to acquiesce in the recent development of the powers of parliament, and the limitation of the royal prerogative.

The old archbishop's character and policy are already suffi-

CHAP.
IX.

ciently known to us. But those of the Prince of Wales and the Beauforts demand a more detailed study. Henry of Monmouth had now reached his twenty-second year. From 1403 till 1408 he had spent the greater part of his life in holding back Glendower; after long and fruitless efforts he had at last seen his work rewarded by victories in the open field, and the recovery of all the fortresses of Wales. But he was not always in his harness, hunting down the rebels on the banks of the Severn or the Towy; each year he had returned for a stay at his father's court during the winter. He had sat in parliaments and joined in debates at the council board. He was a well-known figure in London, and his future was the subject of much speculation with the politicians who watched his father's failing health, and imagined that a new reign was even closer at hand than was actually to be the case. That he was clever, active, vigorous and a splendid soldier no one could dispute; but when released from active service he seemed too much inclined to take his pleasure, in every form, harmless and harmful. His panegyrist and biographer, Thomas of Elmham, confesses that in the days of his early manhood he was anything but steady or sober; not only was he gay and boisterous, a lover of wine and song, but "he served Venus no less fervently than Mars," not without public scandal. Moreover he was hot-tempered, insolent, and arrogant, and made many enemies. Walsingham, putting matters more politely, observes that when he came to the throne he seemed to change his character, and to be turned into another man, distinguished by the qualities that he had previously lacked, honourable, modest and grave. Clearly then the earlier Henry was the reverse of this. The details of his youth which are wanting have been filled up for us by the genius of Shakespeare, but we must remember that the Prince Hal of the dramatist is a fancy portrait, constructed from those same slight hints in the chronicles which we possess ourselves, eked out with untrustworthy Tudor gossip. We have no reason to believe that the prince's favourite companions were disreputable persons of both sexes picked up in Eastcheap taverns, or that he amused himself with highway robbery in his leisure hours. We can detect no Falstaff among his real associates; Sir John Oldcastle, whom the malevolent pen of Tarleton turned into a swindler and buffoon, the prototype of Shakespeare's

Falstaff, was a staid person of high principles. The legends of the prince's wild doings, such as his striking the chief justice on the bench, are mere folk-tales current in the Elizabethan age, and fathered on Henry solely because of his vague reputation for riotous misconduct.¹

But while acknowledging that we know nothing for certain about the details of the prince's youth, and that Shakespeare's portrait of him is a mere hypothetical reconstruction, we must not go to the opposite extreme. It is absurd in the face of the confessions of Elmham, Walsingham, and other panegyrists, to picture him as a blameless paragon, whose virtuous youth gave early promise of his wise manhood.² Clearly his conduct left much to be desired, and often scared the politicians who looked forward to his coming reign. His actions in the next few years seem to prove him contentious, pushing, and wanting in filial affection. As his father's health grew worse he became more and more eager to take his father's place, and grudged at those, notably Archbishop Arundel, who possessed independent power and authority with the invalid monarch.

Despite his superficial faults, Henry was a sincerely religious man after his lights. His piety was of the orthodox sort, and had no touch of speculative thought or innovating zeal. The whole Wycliffite movement was antipathetic to him, and though he had at times some Lollards about him, such as Sir John Oldcastle and Sir John Cheyney, he detested the principles of the reformers, and seems on the whole to have lent himself to persecution with more zeal than did his father. Henry IV. leagued himself with the orthodox party for political reasons, his son supported them out of conscientious dislike for their opponents. His tender mercies, as we shall note in the case of the unhappy Badby, were cruel. It is curious that a young man of strong intellectual power, who had witnessed the scandals of the Great Schism, and knew well the faults and corruptions of the Church, should have shown no sympathy whatever for the party of reform. He was a strict observer of fasts and feasts, a regular

¹ For discussion of the Gascoigne story see Wylie, iv., 93-96, and Church's *Henry V.*, pp. 27-29. It probably had its rise in an action of Edward II. when Prince of Wales, wrongly transferred to Henry V. See also Solly-Flood, *Trans. R. Hist. Soc.*, N.S., iii. (1885).

² Bishop Stubbs leans too much this way in *Const. Hist.*, iii., 82-83.

CHAP. IX. and devout churchgoer, a great giver of alms; his far-off ideal was to lead a crusade against the Turks. He was neither a mystic nor an innovator, but one who trod in a contented spirit the beaten path of medieval devotion, and found that it sufficed him.

The three Beaufort brothers, who appear as Prince Henry's supporters and adherents during the last years of his father's reign, were respectively seventeen, fifteen, and thirteen years older than their half-nephew. They were all capable and ambitious men, but the two younger brothers, Henry and Thomas, seem to have more marked personalities than the eldest, John, Earl of Somerset, who died comparatively young (he was only thirty-seven) in the year 1410. Henry, whom we have already met as chancellor and successively Bishop of Lincoln and Winchester, was a typical prelate-statesman of the later medieval sort, a great pluralist, not too strict in his private morality, more given to political life in London than to caring for the needs of his diocese, which he worked by the aid of a suffragan bishop *in partibus*. He was ambitious and energetic, a capable administrator, but imperious and quarrelsome. He heaped up a huge fortune by methods not always laudable, but showed considerable patriotism and liberality in the way in which he employed it for the public service. In all times of need he lent money freely to the crown; his hoard, indeed, was the first resource to which the Lancastrian kings turned in any time of sudden crisis. His brother Thomas seems to have been a far less reputable person. According to all accounts he was headstrong and violent: he had been the councillor who, more than any other, was responsible for urging the king to the illegal trial and execution of Archbishop Scrope. He is said, moreover, to have treated that unfortunate prelate with gross personal discourtesy when he had charge of him as a prisoner. He was now admiral of England, and in 1411 was promoted to the marquise of Dorset.

The Beauforts were profoundly unpopular with the older baronage, who grudged to see men whom they regarded as upstarts and bastards set in high places among them. The legal position of the family was indeed peculiar; they had been legitimated by Richard II. in 1392, when he was anxious to conciliate his uncle John of Gaunt, and the rehabilitation of their status

had been recognised both by the pope and the parliament. Technically, therefore, they were members of the royal family, and heirs of Lancaster in the unlikely event of the family of Henry IV. becoming extinct. But on February 9, 1407, the king had taken a step which seems to show that he did not like this nearness to the throne; he confirmed the act legitimating his half-brothers, but with a new clause added to the effect that this act did not cover succession to the crown. It was generally believed that the change was made in deference to the advice of Archbishop Arundel, who persuaded Henry that his kinsmen were giving themselves too much of the airs of royalty. It was made, indeed, just after Arundel had for the third time received the seals of chancellor. From this moment the Beauforts and the archbishop were far from friendly to each other; whether the three brothers adhered to the Prince of Wales because he had early shown a distaste for Arundel, or whether it was they who indoctrinated him with the prejudice, we have no evidence. We may suspect, however, that the latter was the case, especially if the story that Henry Beaufort had for a time acted as his nephew's tutor be true.

The successive predominance of the factions of the archbishop and the Beauforts in the king's confidence is best marked by the transferences of the chancellorship from the one to the other. Arundel held it from January 30, 1407, to December 21, 1409; he was followed by Thomas Beaufort, from January 31, 1410, to December 19, 1411; finally, the archbishop recovered it again on January 5, 1412, and retained it till the king died on March 20, 1413. On each occasion the change of office was made without an open breach, and the superseded statesman and his friends continued to sit in the council, and to debate on affairs of state along with the victorious faction. Yet there seems no doubt that what in modern parlance would be called a "change of ministry" had occurred on each occasion. The reason why we cannot clearly distinguish the exact import of each change is partly that the chroniclers, growing more and more jejune as the century progresses, fail to give us the information that we need, and, even more, that the contest was a strife of individuals rather than of policies or principles. Both factions were sound Lancastrians, both aimed at "good governance" within the realm,

CHAP. IX. though the prince and the Beauforts were stronger supporters of the royal prerogative than their opponents; both were eager persecutors of the Lollards; both, in the matter of foreign policy, were eager to intervene in the civil wars of France. Their strife is therefore almost as obscure as it is uninteresting.

In 1409 Arundel was chancellor and his party predominant. The main subjects on which English opinion was interested at the moment were religious rather than political. The doings of the Council of Pisa, which had been summoned to depose the two popes who refused to resign their tiaras, were being followed with eager interest. England sent to the council Chichele, Bishop of St. Davids, Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, and a number of priors and abbots, who took their part in the solemn session in which both the Roman and the Avignonese pontiffs were excommunicated and deposed. England, in common with most of the other powers of Christendom, acknowledged the council's pope, Alexander V., a man whose mild personal virtues might perchance have healed the schism. But he died within less than a year after his election, and the cardinals chose as his successor Balthazar Cossa, archdeacon of Bologna, infamous in history as John XXIII. His notorious disreputability ensured the continuance of the schism, since the best supporters of Gregory and Benedict refused to recognise such a scandalous election.

In the spring of 1409 the primate made an attempt to stamp out the smouldering embers of Lollardy in the University of Oxford. Despite all the previous efforts of Courtenay and of Arundel himself, the secret disciples of Wycliffe were still numerous: a startling proof of this was afforded by the extraordinary letter sent to Bohemia in 1406, with the university seal appended, which informed the doctors of Prague that Wycliffe had been a man of godly life and had never been convicted of heresy.¹ Moved by this and other daring acts and words, Arundel issued his thirteen "constitutions" of April 13, 1409, which enforced on the university a public condemnation

¹ For the details of this strange business see Rashdall's *History of Universities*, ii., 433, and Wylie's *Henry IV.*, iii., 425-26. It seems barely possible that a regular meeting of convocation should have done this daring act. See Maxwell Lyte's *History of the University*, where it is shown that soon afterwards measures were taken for the safer custody of the academic seal.

of all the doctrines of Wycliffe, and ordered the appointment of delegates or censors to suppress them. The clerks of Oxford resisted, fighting in the name of the liberties of the university not in that of Lollardy, but it was the Lollards who were the inspiring spirits in the struggle. It continued for three years and was maintained with extraordinary vigour. When, in the summer of 1411, the primate came down in person to enforce the working of the "constitutions," the Chancellor, Richard Courtenay, and the proctors barred him out of St. Mary's Church, and garrisoned it with scholars armed with bows and bills. Arundel thereupon launched an interdict upon the university, which it calmly ignored. It was only when he turned against it the mandates of the king and council, threatening the use of the secular arm, and backed them by a bull from John XXIII., that he obtained an unwilling submission. The colleges were visited, some of their fellows expelled, and visitations "*quoad hereticam pravitatem*" were repeatedly held. Yet the doctrines of Wycliffe continued to be studied in secret by a lingering minority at Oxford far into the fifteenth century, though it was on the distant banks of the Moldau that they were to be militant and triumphant during that age.

It is notable that while the Lollards of Oxford were still making head against Arundel, there was an outbreak of the old anti-clerical party in parliament. During the session of January-May, 1410, petitions were presented against the employment of the civil magistrates for the arrest of heretics, and an attempt made to get the odious statute *De heretico comburendo* modified into harmlessness. Nor was this all—the old cry of disendowment was once more raised. Now, as in the "unlearned parliament" of 1404, and in Richard II.'s parliament of 1395, statistics were presented to the king showing the enormous wealth in the hands of the clergy, and suggestions were made that it might be turned to better use; the "landed estates of the bishops, abbots, and priors of England would suffice to endow fifteen earls, 1,500 knights, 6,200 esquires, and 100 hospitals". There was, of course, no chance that this demand for the total abolition of clerical landholding would be taken into serious consideration; that it was made at all is surprising, but we are told that in this house of commons there was an "execrable crowd of Lollard

CHAP. IX. knights," true "satellites of Pontius Pilate," who dreamed of nothing but the spoliation of the Church. Sir John Oldcastle was sitting among the lords as Lord Cobham in the right of his wife's barony,¹ and lesser Lollards in the lower house may have taken courage when they saw such a notorious leader of their sect unmolested in his high estate, and openly violating Archbishop Arundel's constitutions by maintaining a chaplain of more than doubtful orthodoxy.

The king refused to listen to these petitions. The Prince of Wales also, as we are told, "openly reprobated their malice, and bade them never for the future dare to put such stuff together". The burden of the statute *De heretico comburendo* should be made harder rather than lightened. Nor was this an idle threat. While parliament was actually sitting the second Lollard martyr was burnt at Smithfield. Many heretics had been arrested and imprisoned since Sawtré's death, but none of them till that year had refused to recant when finally confronted with the stake. But John Badby, a tailor of Evesham, was made of sterner stuff; he had been arrested by the Bishop of Worcester a year before, and convicted of heresy out of his own bold confessions. On March 1, 1410, Archbishop Arundel had him brought before convocation, and gave him an opportunity of recanting his views on the Real Presence. The tailor stood to his opinion, in face of persuasion and threats; the sacramental bread, he declared, was but a symbol or emblem of Christ's body. He dared not believe that the words of consecration created Christ's body—if so, 20,000 Christs were made in England every morning. Remanded to prison for four days, he appeared before the assembled clergy even more trenchant in his statements. Arundel would hear no more, and handed him over to the secular arm. He was taken to Smithfield for execution that same day, March 5: the Prince of Wales was present at the horrid scene. When the victim had been trussed to the stake Henry stepped forward to offer him a final chance of life; the tailor refused to listen, he had nothing to retract. When the faggots were lighted, and the flames fastened on him, Badby uttered dreadful moans of anguish. Moved by the horrible sound, the

¹ Probably in this capacity. But see Mr. W. T. Waugh in *English Historical Review* for 1905.

prince ordered the hangmen to pull back the faggots and drag the victim out of the pile. He lay some time unconscious, but when he had come to himself Henry bade him repent at the eleventh hour, and promised him a free pardon and a pension of threepence a day. Badby sat up, and refused the prince's mercy, "being no doubt," thinks the chronicler, "hardened beyond redemption by the devil". Whereupon Henry bade them tie him to the stake again, and he was burnt to ashes. The tailor showed higher heroism than that which won Agincourt.

CHAP.
IX.

The parliament made a grant of supply in May, after which it was dissolved. The prince and the Beauforts continued to direct the policy of the realm, as they had been doing since Arundel had resigned the chancellorship in the preceding winter. France was by this time deep in civil war. The young duke Charles of Orleans, son of the murdered Louis, was in arms against Burgundy, guided by his warlike father-in-law, Bernard Count of Armagnac, and supported by the Dukes of Brittany, Bourbon, and Berry. In July, 1411, Burgundy, judging that his enemies were too many for him, sent ambassadors to London to offer the hand of his daughter Anne to the Prince of Wales, and to ask for the aid of an English contingent for the oncoming campaign. King Henry had no scruple about accepting the proposal; he was at this moment in one of his intervals of convalescence, and dreamed for a moment of leading an expedition overseas in person. His tents and banners were prepared, and writs were issued to the sheriffs of thirty-five counties ordering them to send up their levies to London by September 23. But the excitement of preparation, or the exhaustion of hard work, brought about a relapse in the king's health. Before the appointed day of assembly he countermanded his army, and announced that no more than an auxiliary contingent of moderate strength would be sent to Flanders. Three hundred men from the garrison of Calais joined the duke in September; in October the main body of the expedition, 600 lances and 2,000 archers, reached Arras: they were commanded by the Earl of Arundel, Sir John Oldcastle, Sir Robert Umfraville and Sir William Bardolph, the loyal brother of the traitor-peer who had fallen at Bramham Moor.

Paris was held for Burgundy by its citizens, who were

CHAP. IX. always opposed to the Orleanist faction; and in Paris lay the insane King Charles and his son the Dauphin. The league of Orleanist princes had captured St. Denis on October 11, and were blockading the capital; no provisions could enter, and famine looked the Parisians in the face. Urgent messages had reached the Duke of Burgundy, begging him to save the city; he had gathered an army in Flanders, and when joined by his English auxiliaries resolved to strike hard and promptly. On the 22nd he reached Pontoise, close outside the ring of Orleanist forts which were encircling the capital; he crossed the Seine at Meudon and was joined by 3,000 Parisian burghers, who had slipped out of the city by an unguarded road. The united army marched into Paris, while the Orleanists shut themselves up in their entrenchments. On November 8 a force of 9,000 men, including all the English auxiliaries, sallied out of the Porte St. Jacques on the south bank of the Seine, and attacked St. Cloud, where a strong division of the enemy lay embattled behind hedges, ditches, and barricades. All the entrenchments were stormed, and about 900 of the defenders slain; on this Orleans and his friends evacuated St. Denis and their other posts and retired towards the Loire. The English contingent had greatly distinguished itself in the battle: dismissed with gifts and thanks on December 18, it returned to Calais across a friendly country.

Every soldier who had taken part in the expedition could see that France in her present state had ceased to be a danger to England. It was clear that the civil war was likely to be as long as it was bitter; in spite of his victory Burgundy had accomplished nothing save the relief of Paris; his adversaries had complete control of the country beyond the Loire, the whole feudal nobility of southern and central France was with them, and it would take many a campaign to bring them to submission. The strength of the two parties was so nicely balanced that England could easily throw the preponderance into one or the other scale. At present it seemed wise to league with Burgundy, who could give English trade invaluable advantages in Flanders, and had always been a less determined enemy than the house of Orleans. But circumstances might arise in which the other faction might make even more profitable counter-offers. It was easy to see that a lucrative if

unscrupulous game might be played, if the English government was prepared to sell itself to the highest bidder. Meanwhile the English captains had brought back no very high estimate of French tactics or strategy, and felt confident of their own ability to deal with any reasonable number of either Orleanist or Burgundian levies. A few years before peace with France was the one desire of every English statesman; now there was a growing conviction that circumstances had changed, and that war had become the more profitable alternative.

While the Earl of Arundel's expedition was still absent in France, King Henry summoned his last parliament to Westminster on November 3, 1411; the session lasted, with one short recess of a week, till December 19, when the members dispersed for the festivities of Christmas. Dissension was rife at the court at this moment. The cause of it was the Prince of Wales's discontent at his father's persistent clinging to the royal crown, when his sickness made him less and less able each year to discharge the royal duties. The special provocation this autumn had been the way in which the elder Henry had declared his intention of sailing for France, had kept an army and a fleet waiting for a month, and had then declared himself unable to start. When parliament met he was confined to his chamber.

Bishop Beaufort, as the spokesman of the faction, formally proposed to the king that he should resign on account of his ever-recurrent infirmity. The suggestion was received with a very bad grace; Henry expressed his indignation, and replied that he would keep his realm, his crown, and his honour as long as there was breath within his body. The prince and his friends were still in places of ministerial responsibility when the parliament met, but the moment it was over they were dismissed. Thomas Beaufort was superseded as chancellor by Arundel, whom he had dispossessed less than two years before; Lord Scrope, the treasurer, was replaced by Sir John Pelham; Bishop Beaufort was removed from the council, and Archbishop Bowet of York substituted. Most notable of all was the fact that the king went so far as to remove his undutiful heir from the presidency of the council. In Henry's place he set his second son, the Lord Thomas, who a few months later was created Duke of Clarence. This young prince was engaged at

CHAP. the moment in a quarrel with the Beauforts; he had just
IX. married Margaret Holland, the young widow of the Earl of Somerset, and was trying to extract from Bishop Henry, who was his brother's executor, the whole of her dowry of 15,000 marks, which the prelate did not appear anxious to surrender. In the meantime he seems to have lent his aid to Arundel, because the primate was the avowed enemy of the whole Beaufort family.¹

It might perhaps have been expected that a moribund king and an aged archbishop would have dealt with France in a less drastic and unscrupulous fashion than the young and warlike prince, who had been controlling English policy in 1411. The reverse was the case: Arundel and his faction behaved in the most Machiavellian way. The Burgundian alliance appeared well established, and the projected marriage between Duke John's daughter and the Prince of Wales was still being discussed, when the English government suddenly threw over their ally and adhered to his enemies. Orleanist agents had arrived in London, offering an enormous bribe: their employers would restore to King Henry the whole duchy of Aquitaine, as it had stood in 1360, in exchange for his alliance. They wished, in return, to be allowed to enlist an English contingent of 4,000 men, whom they offered to pay on a very liberal scale. This offer was too much for the virtue of the king and council: though pledged to Burgundy by all manner of oaths, they accepted the bribe: no one made any objection save the Prince of Wales, who felt bound to criticise every scheme of the hostile faction. His remonstrances only made his father more determined to carry out the scheme. The Duke of Clarence was placed in command of a force that was to sail without delay to aid the Orleanists; with him went the Duke of York and his younger brother, Richard of Cambridge, with the Earls of Oxford and Salisbury. Though somewhat delayed by storms, the army landed near Cape La Hogue about August 9, 1412.

Ere the expedition sailed the Prince of Wales took a step which gave rise to much comment and many suspicions. He wrote to his friends all over the realm, stating that traitors were bringing false accusations against him and endeavouring to sow strife between him and his father, and that he needed help.

¹ See *Chron.*, ed. Giles, p. 63.

He appeared with a considerable number of barons and knights, and such a crowd of retainers as had not been seen assembled for many years. Such a muster seemed to threaten a *coup d'état* and a forced abdication. But Henry contented himself with claiming a formal interview with his father; the king consented to grant it, whether because he was overawed by his son's following or because he had, despite their late quarrel, a sufficient confidence in his good intentions. He was brought down in a great chair, for he was in one of his fits of infirmity, and set in the midst of Westminster Hall. The prince came to meet him with his whole train, but left the main body outside the door, and entered the hall with a few of his special friends only. These stayed apart, while the prince stepped forward. He fell upon his knees, protested his loyalty and affection, and then drew a dagger and proffering it to his father desired him to strike him dead on the spot if he doubted him. The king seemed perplexed by this tragical acting and replied that he believed him to be loyal enough. Whereupon the prince said that all the mischief came from wicked tale-bearers who had slandered him to his father, especially in the matter of the pay of the garrison of Calais, which he was accused of having kept back and diverted. He drew two long rolls of accounts from under his gown, and asked that they might be read and audited. Finally, he begged his father to have those who had spoken ill of him tried, and visited with punishment if they were found guilty "not up to the full measure that they deserved, but within the limits of what was befitting". Henry evidently took the "slanderers" to mean the present ministry, not mere court tale-bearers, for he replied that his son must wait till parliament was again assembled, when they might be impeached before their peers.

Though the king had seemed touched by his son's protestations the prince did not regard the result of the interview as satisfactory. He was in London again in September with a great assembly of his friends, demanding from the council that the detractors who had estranged his father from him should be forced to prove their allegations, and dismissed from office if they failed to do so. This was trespassing very near the borders of sedition, but Henry never actually overpassed them. A curious story of an assassination-plot against the prince be-

CHAP. IX. longs to this period. He was sleeping in the Green Chamber at Westminster, when his attendants were roused by the barking of his spaniel, which lay at his bed-foot. Searching the room they found a man hiding behind the arras. He could not be identified, and when questioned would say nothing save that he had been sent by the Bishop of Winchester. This was absurd, as Bishop Beaufort was one of the prince's faction, and had no interest whatever in harming him. Henry would have been better pleased if the unknown had denounced some member of the present ministry as his employer. Nothing more being got out of him he was handed over to the privy council; the Earl of Arundel was entrusted with his trial, and had him sewn up in a sack and cast into the Thames.

While these curious scenes were being enacted in London, the Duke of Clarence's expedition had come to an ignominious end. The King of France happened this year to be free from his usual fit of midsummer madness. With a sudden outburst of energy he announced that he should take the field himself, and make an end of the traitors who levied civil war in his realm. On this the Dukes of Berry and Bourbon offered to lay down their arms; they declared that they would never fight their king. The submission of his most powerful allies forced Orleans himself to surrender. He came to Auxerre on August 22, did homage to the king and formally renounced his confederacy with England.

Clarence was much disappointed to find that the allies who had called him in had now betrayed him; but after their conduct to Burgundy in the spring English statesmen could make no complaints about treachery on the part of others. The French lords voted that as Orleans had brought the English in, Orleans must get them out. The young duke offered to buy off the invaders; he had promised by the treaty of Westminster to pay them three months' wages of war; this sum, 210,000 gold crowns, he and his confederates agreed to disburse on condition that Clarence departed at once. Duke Thomas got leave from his father to accept it—on November 14, 1412, in face of a reunited France, no other course was possible. He retired to Bordeaux with his army and there disbanded it.

This well-merited discomfiture of the attempt to interfere in French politics was the last important event in the reign.

Henry had now less than five months to live; after October, 1412, he was never strong enough to quit the vicinity of London. He had summoned a parliament to meet at Westminster on February 3, 1413, but put it off by several successive prorogations, because he did not feel able to face the necessary fatigues of the session. Somewhere about Mid-Lent he swooned while worshipping before the shrine of St. Edward in Westminster Abbey. He was hastily borne away, not into his palace, but into the abbot's lodgings, and laid in the so-called Jerusalem Chamber, which he never quitted, though he survived for some days. One of the chroniclers records his last conversation with his confessor; Friar Tille, it is said, pressed him to repent of three things before all others, the murders of Richard II. and Archbishop Scrope, and his usurpation of the crown. Henry replied that as to the first two he laid the whole truth before the pope, had performed the penances imposed on him, and received absolution. "As to the crown it were hard to set a remedy, for my children will not suffer that it go out of our lineage."¹ On March 20 he sent for his eldest son, pardoned him any grief that he had caused by his eagerness to seize the reins of power, kissed him, and prayed "that the blessing which Isaac gave to his son Jacob might rest upon him, and that God might grant him to rule in the future as a virtuous and happy prince".² The prince sat by his side weeping for some time, and then withdrew to his oratory, and knelt there beating his breast and sobbing at the remembrance of his late unfilial conduct.³

The king died at nightfall of the same day, March 20. His body lay in state at Westminster for some time, and was finally taken by water to Canterbury. There it was buried, as Henry had specially desired, in the Chapel of the Trinity behind the high altar, close to the tomb of his uncle, the Black Prince. Many years after his second wife, Queen Joan of Navarre, was laid beside him, and her effigy joined his on the great slab that covers their bones. The figure over his grave is the only trustworthy representation of him that survives; his square face, heavy chin, broad forehead, short forked beard, and closely cropped hair form an unmistakable portrait—that of a man ambitious and determined, capable and politic, a fit founder of

¹ Capgrave, *Chronicle*, p. 303.

² Elmham, *Vita Henrici V.*, p. 14.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

CHAP. IX. a dynasty. He left his son a throne that no longer tottered, and a realm that was at last reduced to quiet and advancing to prosperity. He had got the baronage in hand, and at the price of surrendering some of his prerogative had arrived at a satisfactory *modus vivendi* with his parliament. It seemed that it would be not his but his successors' fault if ever the house of Lancaster lost the crown of England.

CHAPTER X.

ST. GILES'S FIELDS AND AGINCOURT.

DOWN to the very moment of his accession the character of Henry of Monmouth presented a serious and not too reassuring problem to his contemporaries. They knew that he was clever, ambitious, energetic and a good soldier; they also knew that he was arrogant, contentious, given to pleasure and loose-living. A similar mixture of qualities had made Edward III. a very unsatisfactory sovereign; would the reign of his great-grandson reproduce the old evils—favourites, quarrels with parliament, debt, wars conducted on the principles of a knight-errant rather than on those of a national king? A few short days sufficed to dissipate the doubt. Henry V. had two characteristics which Edward III. had lacked, a sincere, if narrow, piety, and a deep sense of responsibility. His first act after closing his father's eyes was to betake himself to a certain anchorite who dwelt by Westminster Abbey; he went secretly, made a long and frank confession of his sins and faults, and asked for absolution, as a penitent who had resolved to make an entire change in his manner of living. It was neither hysterical remorse for the trouble that he had given to his father, nor self-deceiving hypocrisy that inspired him, but a settled resolve to do his duty as a king. The change in him was visible from the first moment of his public appearance. Every man about the court marvelled at the sober and grave bearing with which he discharged the first functions of his new office, at the absence of the arrogant and rancorous remembrance of old quarrels which they had expected to meet.

Henry indeed presents a curious character-study from the moment of his accession. He was only twenty-five, a young man still, even according to the notions of the fifteenth century.

CHAP.
X.

CHAP.
X.

But from this moment he put all signs of youth behind him, and showed himself as staid, cautious, and deliberate as any man of middle age. He used his iron will to suppress the hot, impulsive temper of the house of Lancaster. He tried to make each one of his actions square with his rigid ideas of orthodox piety. The result was to produce an effect of hardness and unnatural self-restraint. It was only in the moment of battle, or in the excitement of field-sports, the only one of his old frivolities to which he remained attached, that the natural man emerged. At other times he was the model king, courteous, laborious, self-contained, deliberate, but certainly not genial or spontaneous. His piety made him a persecutor; in politics he saw clearly what was profitable to his dynasty, and sought that end unswervingly, unconscious apparently that a Christian king has any duty towards his neighbours. His statecraft was as narrow as his religion. Later generations made him a national hero; Shakespeare redrew his picture as the most splendid type of manly courage and wisdom. But we must confess that the original—the spare, tight-lipped, close-cropped, wary-eyed, square-jawed Henry of the fifteenth century portraits, is a very different person. He commands our intellectual and moral respect, but no one can call him a sympathetic or a lovable character.

Henry showed from the first that he intended to carry out his own policy, not merely to continue his father's. His earliest act was to request Archbishop Arundel to surrender the great seal, and to create Bishop Beaufort chancellor in his stead. At the same moment Sir John Pelham was dismissed from the treasury, and the Earl of Arundel, who was not a political follower of his uncle, the primate, took his place. Thus the new king reverted to the ministerial arrangements of 1411. But he showed no sign of resentment against the old ex-chancellor, and treated him with scrupulous courtesy. On March 28 he also dismissed from office Sir William Gascoigne, the chief justice.¹

Parliament met a little more than a month after the coronation, which took place on April 9. Perhaps the most notable event at its first assembling was the appearance of the

¹ Not, as we have reason to believe, in consequence of any early quarrel with him, such as that of which legends tell (see Wylie, *Henry IV.*, vol. iii., and Solly-Flood in *Proceedings of the Royal Historical Society*, N.S., iii., 1885).

young Earl of March in his proper seat among the peers. He was twenty-two years of age—old enough to be the leader of a party or a conspiracy in those days of precocious manhood. It argued, therefore, considerable magnanimity on the part of the king that he should have been set free from the captivity to which he had been so long consigned, restored to his place of honour, and given back his enormous estates on the Welsh border. Henry, as events showed, was fully justified in the confidence which he showed in the earl. He served his liberator faithfully, refused to be made the tool of traitors, even when they were his nearest kin, and remained a loyal subject all his life. The session was short: it only lasted from May 15 to June 9. The new chancellor made the usual promises of good governance in the king's name, and announced that his master would always be ready to receive the advice of the faithful peers and commons on high matters of administration, finance, and foreign policy. The houses took him at his word, and sent up petitions full of the old complaints—the peace of the seas might be better kept, economy was still desirable in the royal household, the pope ought to be restrained from his inveterate meddling in the matter of provisors, and so forth. But they showed their readiness to give the king a fair start, by granting him very liberal supplies. Further criticism would be deferred till it was seen how he dealt with his realm.

When, therefore, the houses had dispersed Henry was left free, with power to make or mar his reputation. The main problems which lay before him were two, which his father during his long illness had dealt with in a somewhat hesitating fashion. Was a serious attempt to be made to suppress Lollardy, and was active interference in the civil wars of France to be continued or renounced? The old king's persecution of the Lollards had been carried out in a very spasmodic fashion. He permitted the burning of a stubborn sectary like Sawtré or Badby at long intervals, but he had never sanctioned a general attack upon the Lollards in high places. Indeed he had employed men like Cheyney, Savage, and Oldcastle, whose opinions were notorious, in important military and diplomatic posts. In short, he had been a mere politician, who perpetrated a certain amount of persecution of insignificant persons in order

CIIAP. to conciliate the churchmen to whom he owed his throne.
 X. A poor chaplain or a tailor he might surrender to the mercies of the primate; their friends were a negligible quantity; not so were those of the knot of wealthy Lollard knights who sat in parliament. Therefore as long as Henry IV. lived such men went unmolested. Henry V., on the other hand, was an honest fanatic; he had no doubt whatever that his father had shown a deplorable weakness in dealing with the question of Lollardy. Heresy, as he opined, was to be suppressed by striking down the leaders, not by making an occasional example among the led. Accordingly he resolved to bring the statute *De heretico comburendo* to bear upon the supporters of Lollardy in high places.

There was no doubt as to the person at whom his first blow must be levelled; he would start with the greatest of the heretics—the only one of them who sat in the house of lords—Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, whom we have already heard of as one of the commanders of the army that went to France in 1411. He had married as his second wife a great heiress, Joan, the grand-daughter of John Lord Cobham, and possessed her strong castle of Cooling and her broad estates in Kent. Oldcastle was not merely an accomplished knight, but also—a rare phenomenon among laymen in the early fifteenth century—a student and a man of learning. He was not merely one of those Lollards who “babbled the Bible day and night,” as the contemporary satirist complained, but had read the fathers and the works of Aristotle. His remarkable letter to the Bohemian inquirers, who wrote in 1410 for information as to Wycliffe's life and doctrines, is written in an excellent style, and argues wide controversial knowledge of all the debated questions of the day. The writer quotes Isidore, Chrysostom, and Augustine to back some of Wycliffe's points.¹ Long immunity from persecution had made him contemptuous of the archbishop's oft-repeated threats, and he frequently entertained the preachers of his sect, both at his ancestral seat in Herefordshire and at his wife's castle in Kent.

It was against Oldcastle, therefore, that the king and primate

¹ For this letter, see Loserth's paper in *Mittheilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, vol. xiv. (1891), p. 254, and notes thereon by Dr. Poole in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, vii., 309 (1892). The letter's date is September 8, 1410.

directed the first attack. The lower house of convocation formally delated him as a heretic, and the archbishop laid the document before his sovereign. Henry's sense of justice forbade him to condemn one of his father's faithful servants without a fair warning. Oldcastle was summoned to Windsor, but he came to argue and not to recant. He shocked the king by his free handling of accepted doctrines, and finally withdrew without leave and retired to his castle of Cooling. Arundel then received leave to proceed to extremities. Oldcastle was arrested, and on September 23 the primate, with the Bishops of London and Winchester as assessors, sat to try him in the chapter-house of St. Paul's. He was offered pardon and absolution, but replied that he required no absolution, and launched out into an elaborate explanation of his creed. He drew a long document from his breast and read it: it was very carefully worded, and to a casual hearer might have passed as an orthodox statement of faith. But Arundel could at once detect the Wycliffite theories that lurked in its reservations and omissions. "Hah, Sir John!" he said, "in this schedule of yours there is much good stuff and catholic doctrine; but you must answer me whether or not you hold that the material bread remains in the sacrament of the altar after consecration duly performed." There lay the dividing line between Lollardy and medieval orthodoxy. Oldcastle answered that he had already set forth his view on this point at great length in his paper, and refused to give any further reply. He was remanded to prison, and on the following Monday he was cross-examined on four points—transubstantiation, confession, the adoration of the cross, and the power of the keys.

This time the prisoner made no attempt to disguise his opinions. The eucharistic wafer, he said, was at once the true body of Christ and material bread: the view that the substance of the bread vanished at the consecration-prayer was erroneous. Confession and penance were salutary, but not necessary: it was true contrition, not the priest's words of absolution, that justified a sinner before God. As to the cross, it was Christ hanging on the cross, not the material wood, that demanded reverence. On the last point put before him, the power of the keys, he burst out into vehement language. "The pope of to-day," he cried, "is anti-Christ. Your bishops and prelates are

CHAP. the members of the beast, and the friars are his tail. No pope
X. or prelate should be obeyed save he who is in his life, manners, and conversation the true follower of Christ and of Peter." Then he swerved round to face the people in the body of the chapter-house and cried with a loud voice: "These men who now try me and wish to condemn me seduce both you and their own souls. They are leading you on the path to hell; wherefore beware of them." There was no more to be gained by arguing with such a steadfast heretic, whereupon Arundel proceeded to pass sentence without further delay, handing over the prisoner to the secular arm to be dealt with as a convicted heresiarch. He was taken back to the Tower, and was to be burnt on November 4 if he refused to recant. But on October 19 he disappeared from his dungeon: the details of his escape are unknown, save that it was contrived by one William Fisher, a parchment maker in Smithfield, who corrupted some of the minor officials of the Tower.

The Lollards, who had suffered for their faith in earlier years, had been priests and burghers, men of peace. But Oldcastle was a high-spirited gentleman and a soldier; he was prepared to die for his opinions, but he preferred to die under arms rather than at the stake. Finding himself free, he took in hand a wild undertaking, a revolution to be carried out by main force; it was a desperate plan—as desperate as the Gunpowder Plot or the Cato Street conspiracy. But the condition of the Lollards was desperate also, now that their old enemy the archbishop was backed by a fanatical king. Moreover they believed themselves to be stronger than was actually the case: there was a great body of them in London and a considerable sprinkling in most parts of central England. They hoped to be joined by many of the gentry who, if not avowed Wycliffites, were members of that anticlerical party which was so often prominent in parliament. In later years Oldcastle is said to have appealed to the old partisans of Richard II., and to have used the name of the Earl of March as a rallying cry. But in 1413 it seems to have been his design merely to seize the person of King Henry, keep him in custody, and act in his name. There are some faint indications that he intended also to work on social discontents. Some of his emissaries are said to have stirred up the country-folk with

the old watchwords of 1381, promising that there should be an end made of landlords, as well as a distribution of Church property among the elect. This may be a calumny of the enemy, but it is possible that the wilder spirits among the sectaries may have had some such dreams. Be this as it may, it is certain that the more desperate Lollards pledged themselves to a rising. It was to take place after Christmas, when the king had announced that he would hold high festival in his palace of Eltham. Bands stealing in secretly from all quarters were to mass themselves, surprise the palace, and seize the king. When he was caught Oldcastle was to proclaim himself protector or regent and set up a new government in his captive's name. Just as the plot was ripe the king heard some rumour of it, and hastily moved from Eltham to Westminster. He began to collect armed men, but gave no further sign of his knowledge of the design. Oldcastle evidently thought it too late to countermand his insurrection, indeed his partisans from the remoter shires must have been already on the march. The muster was fixed for January 9, 1414, after dusk; the trysting-place was St. Giles's Fields, north of Charing Cross, a spot from which it would be possible to swoop down on Westminster in half an hour. Henry, however, well informed of every detail by some traitor, was ready to take the offensive instead of waiting to be attacked. Before dusk he ordered the gates of London to be closed, and placed a heavy guard at each. Numerous parties of citizens came clamouring to be let out, but shrank back when they saw the men-at-arms, and guessed that the plot had been discovered. Meanwhile the king, with the main body of his troops, had placed himself under cover of hedges and walls beside St. Giles's Fields, and waited for the bands that were coming in from the country. When the first of them had begun to unite, he charged out upon them, and scattered them in an instant. Some few were slain, a great number captured, but the major part, including Oldcastle himself, escaped under cover of the darkness. Several parties which arrived late fell into the midst of the royal host, and suffered the same fate as the early comers.

When the prisoners were examined they were found to include representatives of nearly every midland shire. The chief of them were Sir Roger Acton, a knight of Shropshire, a squire named John Brown, a Lollard priest named Beverley,

CHAP. and William Murley, a rich brewer of Dunstable. Sixty-nine
X. of them were convicted of treason at courts held at the Tower and Westminster on January 12. Of these thirty-seven were hung as traitors next day, seven being afterwards burnt, gallows and all, as notorious heretics. The remaining thirty-two received lighter punishments of imprisonment and fines. All the four leaders named above were, of course, among the sufferers. Thus ended an insurrection which from the first presented little prospect of success. Even if successful for the moment, the Lollards could not have hoped to hold down all England. They could only have succeeded by allying themselves with some strong and discontented political party, and at this particular moment there was no such party in existence. Unlike the Hussites in Bohemia a few years later, the disciples of Wycliffe made no appeal either to a national sentiment or to an anti-dynastic faction. Moreover, many of their own sect disapproved on moral and religious grounds of the policy of appealing to the sword.

Oldcastle fled to his native Herefordshire, and lay hid among the hills. Sometimes he showed himself with a band of followers on Malvern Chase; sometimes he was lost to sight in Wales. It is curious that he seems to have made no attempt to join Owen Glendower, whose plight was so similar to his own. The aged outlaw was still alive, lurking with his only surviving son, Meredith, in the highlands at the head of the Severn valley. He survived over the next year, and we hear of a last attempt to induce him to surrender on terms of pardon so late as February, 1416; he would appear to have died very shortly after that date. If he and Oldcastle ever crossed Radnor Forest to talk treason together, no record has been preserved of the meeting.

When parliament met on April 30 at Leicester the alarm caused by the wild plot of the Lollards was evident. The main topic of Chancellor Beaufort's opening speech was that the king demanded the support of the nation against the heretics. An act was passed to compel all the officers of the crown to assist the ordinaries in putting down heresy. After this the persecution went on briskly. The sectaries were now traitors as well as schismatics, and it was the king, not merely the clergy, who was urging on the search. Archbishop Arundel

indeed had died on February 19, but the hunt was not slackened on that account. The new primate, Henry Chichele, was a far weaker and milder man than his predecessor, and never took such a dominating part in politics. But his comparative insignificance and lack of truculent energy was of no such profit to the Lollards as it might have been under Henry IV. It was the king himself who was now the arch-persecutor. The other proceedings of the Leicester parliament were unimportant; tunnage and poundage were continued to the king for another three years, and Henry assented to an act providing that petitions should always be enrolled in the statute book exactly as they had been drafted, without any change of words, or perversion of their original intent. At this same assembly some promotions were made in the peerage: the king's younger brothers were created dukes, John taking the title of Bedford, Humphrey that of Gloucester. His other brother Thomas was confirmed in the dukedom of Clarence, and his half-uncle, Thomas Beaufort, in the marquise of Dorset, both of which had been granted by Henry IV. during the time of his illness. Finally, of the two brothers of the house of York, the elder, Edward, was freed from all disabilities incurred by him for his treason in 1400 and his later suspicious actions, while the younger, Richard, was made Earl of Cambridge.

There was another problem facing Henry V. at the moment of his accession, his foreign policy. With France there was a long truce still running, which would not expire till February, 1415; but meanwhile that realm was sinking back into civil war, and it was clear that when hostilities recommenced England would once more be solicited to intervene by one or both of the French factions. The young dauphin Louis, who in 1412 was still no more than the tool of John the Fearless, was now a year older and was beginning to show signs of developing a will of his own. After the great riots in Paris in May, 1413, when the mob, led by the skinner Simon Caboche, burst into his palace and murdered his servants, the dauphin threw himself into the hands of the Orleanist party, brought up their levies from the south and expelled the Burgundian faction from the capital. When Duke John raised an army in Flanders and advanced on St. Denis, he was outlawed and proclaimed a traitor. The ambassadors of Burgundy presented themselves

CHAP. at Leicester, and on May 23 signed a formal treaty by which
X. the King of England and the duke agreed to attack the Orleanist party in common, and to share between them all conquests "saving the rights of the King of France". Henry, therefore, had committed himself to the resumption of his old policy of 1411.

He intended however to appear not as an auxiliary, but as principal in the strife. For on May 31 he sent ambassadors across the Channel with orders to demand from the king, now in the hands of the Orleanist party, the "restitution of his ancient rights in France". This phrase covered nothing less than the revival of the treaty of 1360, and even of the preposterous claims of Edward III. to the French crown. The ambassadors were directed to commence their negotiations by declaring that Henry was the rightful King of France, as male heir of his great-grandfather, and that he would assert his claims unless he was bought off. His price was to be the hand of the Princess Katharine and a great cession of territory. He asked for the whole of the immense regions that Henry II. had owned in 1154, and even for a trifle more. Beside Aquitaine, he demanded Anjou, Touraine, Maine, Normandy, and the feudal superiority over Brittany, in short the whole Angevin empire. And in addition he wanted Ponthieu, the heritage of the queen of Edward I.; a share of Provence in right of Eleanor, wife of Henry III.; and, most preposterous of all, the Boulonnais and the feudal superiority over Flanders, apparently on no claim of heritage or ancient possession whatever. Either Henry was set on picking a quarrel, and intended to fight at all costs while France was torn by civil war, or he was acting like the Levantine huckster who asks seven times what his wares are worth, in the hope of ultimately getting twice their value. The peculiar absurdity of raking up the claims of Edward III. was, of course, that they depended on a denial of the Salic law, and implied that the inheritance of the French crown might pass through females. But if this was so, then Edmund of March was rightful monarch of France, not Henry of Lancaster. For if descent through females was allowed to count, the living descendants of Lionel of Clarence, the elder brother, stood before the representative of John of Gaunt, the younger brother. Even Henry can hardly have supposed that the vote of the English

parliament, which gave the crown to his father in 1399, had any legal effect in France. Yet that is what his claim implied.

The English ambassadors, Bishops Langley of Durham and Courtenay of Norwich, accompanied by the Earl of Salisbury, reached Paris in July. They were politely received by the Duke of Berri and the French council, but could get no business done, for the dauphin, with Orleans and the other princes of their faction, was conducting a campaign in Artois against the Duke of Burgundy. They did not intend to give the King of England a definite answer till they saw how the fortune of war would turn. If they beat and disabled Duke John, they might laugh at Henry's claims. But neither party proved strong enough to crush the other, and on September 4 they signed a truce, the "Pacification of Arras," by which each bound itself to make no private treaty or alliance with England. This agreement emboldened the French council to send away the English ambassadors without an answer. Unhappily, however, for all parties concerned, Burgundy within a very few days of the pacification of Arras sent a secret embassy to London, to renew the proposals that he had made in the spring. On September 29 a new Anglo-Burgundian treaty was signed and the King of England resolved on war.

As a necessary preliminary a parliament, the second of the year, was summoned to Westminster on November 19. The Chancellor Beaufort announced that France had refused to satisfy the king's righteous demands, and that Henry was minded to take forcible measures for the recovery of the ancient rights of the crown beyond the seas. He was, therefore, constrained to ask for a liberal subsidy; the state of affairs had completely changed since April, when he had been able to state that no extraordinary taxation was required. The estates showed themselves willing to accept these statements, and voted two tenths and two fifteenths, to be raised half on February 15, 1415, and half on February 2, 1416. But apparently they were not fully convinced that good terms might not be extorted from France without open war, for they recommended that hostilities should not begin till a final attempt had been made to come to a peaceful agreement. Henry offered no objection, but undoubtedly made up his mind that any such negotiations should fail. The Bishops of Durham

CHAP. and Norwich went back to Paris and renewed the demands
X. that they had made in the summer. They asked for less in the way of territory than in August, but made indefensible demands for monetary compensation. Henry would be satisfied with the whole duchy of Aquitaine as held by the Black Prince—he was now holding less than a fourth of it—half Provence, and the lordships of Beaufort and Nogent. But he demanded the whole arrears of the ransom money of King John, a matter fifty years old, which amounted to 1,600,000 gold crowns, and 1,000,000 crowns more as a marriage portion for the Princess Katharine.

To this proposal the French council made a reply which shows how much they dreaded foreign invasion at the moment when the faith of the Duke of Burgundy was uncertain. Probably they had already some knowledge of the secret treaty lately concluded at London. The terms that they offered were liberal beyond measure; Henry should have Bigorre, the Agenais and Bazadais, Perigord, the towns and districts of Lectoure, Condom and Auch in Gascony, Quercy, save the town of Montauban, the parts of Saintonge and Angoumois which lie to the south of the river Charente, and the Isle of Oleron. In addition the Princess Katharine should have a dower of 800,000 crowns. This cession would have more than doubled the present English holding in Guienne, and would have left Henry V. in possession of two-thirds of the old duchy of Aquitaine. To make such an offer argued conscious weakness on the part of the French government. So at least thought Henry, who refused to give his ambassadors permission to accept it. They left Paris for London at the end of March. After their return the king wrote an ultimatum, couched in terms which sound strangely hypocritical. He called God to witness as to the purity of his motives, and his desire for peace, which, as he said, was necessary for the healing of the schism of the Church. If Charles refuses to grant the English demands, "if you defer opening, when we continue knocking with importunity at the closed door of your conscience," then France becomes responsible for the protraction of the agony of the Church, and keeps holy Zion under the yoke of bondage. Finally, and this is the most impudent clause of all, the very liberal terms proposed in March are

described as "offers so small that not one lord in the kingdom of England would be satisfied with them".

On April 16, the very day after he had written this preposterous document, Henry formally announced to his privy council that he should invade France during the course of the summer, and issued orders for the levying of an army. All the fine language had been intended for local English consumption. The paragraphs concerning the Great Schism were an allusion to the preparations for the council of Constance. The king had already appointed a body of delegates who were to betake themselves to the council: it consisted of the Bishops of Salisbury, Bath, and Hereford, the Prior of Worcester, several other ecclesiastics, and the Earl of Warwick. It was in order to avoid antagonism between the representatives of England and France in the oncoming synod, that Henry explained to the French king that it was his duty to accept the exorbitant terms offered him. That the same laudable end might have been secured by mitigating his own demands does not seem to have occurred to him.

Meanwhile preparations were made for the safe-guarding of the realm during the king's absence. Glendower was offered a free pardon, but in vain. The regent of Scotland was propitiated by the release of his son Murdoch Earl of Fife, a prisoner ever since the day of Homildon. But Albany's quiescence was best secured by the fact that Henry always had it in his power to loose the young King James. This unspoken argument kept the Scottish government friendly, though the majority of the nobility of the realm favoured the French cause. To provide against casual raids, the Earl of Westmorland was assigned a permanent force of 200 spears and 400 bows for the custody of the marches. A force of only half that size was thought sufficient for Wales. The general charge of domestic affairs was to be assigned to John, Duke of Bedford, as lieutenant of the realm; Henry's second brother and former rival, Thomas of Clarence, was about to join the expedition to France. The Chancellor Beaufort and a small council of four prelates and five peers were to assist Bedford.

The task of collecting and equipping the army and the fleet for the "voyage of Normandy" proved to be a somewhat longer business than had been anticipated, and the mustering day was

CHAP. twice put off. But on June 18 Henry departed from London,
X. after having offered his oblations in St. Paul's, and taken a ceremonious farewell of his stepmother, the queen dowager, and the mayor and corporation. On the 30th he was at Winchester, where he was met by a French embassy, sent to meet him in a last attempt to stave off the invasion. It consisted of the Archbishop of Bourges, the Counts of Vendôme and Tancarville and the Bishop of Lisieux. Even if Henry had been set on peace at an earlier date, it was now too late to move him from his warlike intent; his money was spent, his ships collected, his army was concentrating. After six days of negotiation the ambassadors offered to add to the liberal terms which their master had promised in April the districts of Tulle and Limoges, and an extra 40,000 gold crowns, in addition to the 800,000 already assigned for the Princess Katharine's dowry. After dallying for a moment with this proposal, Henry declared that, if he accepted it, the whole of the Aquitanian lands ceded to him must be made over free of any homage to the King of France, as an independent principality, and the 840,000 crowns must be paid him before St. Andrew's day next. The ambassadors declared that such a large sum of money could not be collected in four months, and that they were not authorised to surrender the dower lands free of all feudal obligations to the French crown.

Henry at once bade the envoys depart. Seeing all chance of an agreement at an end, the Archbishop of Bourges, as it is said, burst out into a passionate harangue, in which he declared, with perfect truth, that his master's offers had been both liberal and honest, that the French court had only gone so far because they wished to avoid the responsibility of the rupture, "to avoid the shedding of innocent blood, and that Christian people might not be overwhelmed by the miseries of war". He, too, made his appeal to heaven, and trusted that in a just cause France would be granted the aid of God, the Virgin, and all the blessed saints. Death, defeat or captivity would await the unrighteous invader. One account adds that the ambassador ended by saying, that as to the old claim to the French crown, of which they had heard so much during the negotiations, Henry was not even the true representative of Edward III., "you have no lordship even in this kingdom

of England, which belongs to the true heirs of the late King Richard II." If this last taunt was ever made, it is not hard to understand why the English chronicles declare that Archbishop Bouratier was an arrogant and insolent person.¹

Henry remained for the next month in Hampshire, urging on the embarkation of troops and stores at Portsmouth and Southampton. He was at the latter place when, upon July 20, a most unexpected and, indeed, incomprehensible conspiracy was revealed to him. The chief plotter was Richard of York, the newly created Earl of Cambridge, a singularly obscure personage in history, considering that he was a prince of the blood. The sole reason for which he was notable was his marriage to Anne Mortimer, the sister of the Earl of March. But as the earl was only twenty-three years of age, and had been lately married, no one could have guessed at that time that his sister would be his heiress. Apparently Cambridge considered that his simple, unambitious brother-in-law would make a good *roi fainéant*, for whom he could act as mayor of the palace. The second conspirator was Henry, Lord Scrope of Masham, a kinsman of the unfortunate archbishop executed in 1405, a man of middle age, who had served Henry IV. as lord treasurer in 1410-11, and was a trusted servant of the new king also. The third was another northern magnate, Sir Thomas Grey of Heton, a kinsman of the Percies. According to Cambridge's confession, he and his confederates intended to carry off the Earl of March into Wales, and there proclaim him king as the rightful heir of Richard II. A certain David ap Howel had covenanted to betray to them some of the castles of North Wales, and two Northumbrian gentlemen, named Widdrington and Umphraville, were to bring in from Scotland a body of Douglas retainers, and to raise the whole north in the name of the young Henry Percy, the son of Hotspur. No mention is made of any agreement with Oldcastle, but it is a suggestive coincidence that at this very moment the Lollard knight came down from the hills and made an incursion into Worcestershire.

The whole plot—a singularly ill-arranged and hazardous affair—depended on March's willingness to embark in treason. But when his brother-in-law broached the matter to him, the

¹ "Nimis petulanter se gerens in peroratione suæ legationis" (Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, ii., 305).

CHAP. earl went straight to the king and told him all. Henry struck
X. without hesitation; Cambridge, Scrope and Grey were arrested that same day, August 1, and brought next morning before a commission, consisting of seven peers and two judges. This body directed the sheriff of Hampshire to empanel a common jury, before which the prisoners were arraigned. The verdict was that Cambridge and Grey were guilty of treason, and Lord Scrope of misprision of treason, in that he had failed to disclose the plot when Cambridge had opened it to him. Grey, being a commoner, was immediately beheaded. Earl Richard and Scrope claimed their privilege as peers, and demanded that they should be tried before the house of lords; but there was this difference between them, that Cambridge confessed and besought mercy,¹ while Scrope pleaded not guilty.² On August 5 the prisoners were indicted before a court presided over by Thomas, Duke of Clarence, and consisting of nineteen peers, all that were available on the spot. After a short trial, wherein nothing but Cambridge's confession and the verdict of the local jury seems to have been adduced, they were found guilty and condemned to death. On the same afternoon both were beheaded outside the north gate of Southampton.

Five days later the king went on board his flagship, the *Trinity Royal*, at Portsmouth, and stood out into the roadstead. The other vessels from Southampton and the smaller harbours near put out to join him that afternoon. Next day, August 11, at dawn the whole fleet ran down past Bembridge Point, and set their course for the mouth of the Seine with a favourable north-west breeze. His army appears to have consisted of about 2,500 lances and 8,000 archers, with some 1,000 men more belonging to the auxiliary services—gunners, miners, smiths, armourers, carpenters, fletchers, labourers, etc.³ There

¹ Cambridge in his confession showed some acrimony against his brother-in-law, who he declared gave his assent to the plot when it was laid before him, and did not allow him to suspect that he was not a consenting party. See also Adam of Usk, p. 325.

² He had the meanness to plead that he had only acquiesced in Cambridge's proposals in order to get a full knowledge of them, and that he had intended to reveal them in good time.

³ The list in Sir H. Nicolas's *Agincourt* is the authority; it is taken from Sloane MS., 6400, supplemented by the list of persons in the *Calendar of the Norman Rolls*, printed by Carte. It is not quite complete for the retinues of the smaller knights and squires; on the other hand, it contains a certain amount of

were twenty surgeons and sixteen chaplains borne on the rolls. Of the archers rather more than half, 4,128 as against 3,771, were horsed—not of course as combatants on horseback, but as mounted infantry. The army, unlike those which Edward III. and the Black Prince had been wont to lead, was almost entirely composed of native English troops. Among the hundreds of names contained in the extant lists we find only four Netherlanders, two Frenchmen, and one Spaniard among the men-at-arms, and ninety-eight foreign cross-bowmen, nearly all brought by one of the French adventurers, among the infantry.

CHAP.
X.

English invasions of France had hitherto, almost without exception, been conducted with the true medieval disregard of strategy—as chivalrous adventures or mere raids in search of plunder. A realm full of castles and strong towns, like the France of the Valois, could not be subdued by casual incursions, or even by victories in the open field. No permanent hold upon it could be secured save by mastering one after another its great fortresses. It would seem that Henry V. discerned the futility of the exploits of his predecessors: he came prepared, not for a circular tour of devastation in Normandy, but for a series of sieges: he would first establish a base for himself in a sea-coast fortress, and then spread the area of conquest inland as far as his strength permitted. His purpose is indicated by the fact that he had brought miners, masons, and heavy artillery in great store. Of course he might also have to fight a battle, since the enemy would probably make some effort to save the fortress at which he was aiming; if so, so much the better, for pitched battles had always been the happy chance for the English invader in the old war.

On August 13 the fleet cast anchor at the Chef de Caux, inside the northern bank of the estuary of the Seine. No opposition was offered to the landing, which took place in an orderly fashion during the next three days. An active and wary enemy, who had received some weeks of warning, might

what are apparently duplicate entries. The total given above cannot be very far out. There are 121 persons whose retinues are not stated in a list of about 500 names; but of these thirty-two are marked as already accounted for in the contingents of the greater barons; of the remaining eighty-nine, all, with few exceptions, are insignificant.

CHAP. have had some scheme of coast defence for Normandy already
X. organised; but the government of France in August, 1415, was neither active nor wary. The king—as always in summer-time—was labouring under one of his attacks of imbecility. The dauphin was a frivolous and worthless boy of nineteen. Orleans and the other princes, the real masters of the realm, were selfish and careless. Burgundy, whose secret treaty with England was already suspected, was plotting to throw the whole burden of the war on the faction whose fall he desired. The only measure of precaution that had been taken when Henry landed was that a heavy tallage had been decreed for the levy of an army. It was still in process of collection, not without much popular discontent.

Harfleur, Henry's first objective, was at this moment guarded only by its own burghers, and 100 lances hastily raised by the local gentry. Three hundred more, however, got into the place before the investment was complete, under the Sire de Gaucourt, who had been named governor by the dauphin. The town was small but strong; it lay on the north side of the Seine mouth, some seven or eight miles to the east of the modern Havre, a place not founded until the following century. It was built on both sides of the little river Lézarde, which flows into its tidal harbour, and the burghers had dammed up the stream and caused it to flood the fields north of the town. This device much incommoded the besiegers, who were forced to send half their force round the inundation, in order to invest the east side of the place. The communication between the two corps could only be kept up by boats, or by a long circuit round the floods.

The siege went on for some three weeks. The weather was exceptionally hot, and this, combined with over-fatigue and the pestilential exhalations from the newly formed marsh, induced fevers and dysenteries, which thinned the ranks of the English in the most terrible fashion. The Bishop of Norwich and the Earl of Suffolk died, with many more, but a much larger proportion of the army lay sick and disabled. Yet if the besiegers were suffering the besieged were near the edge of despair. They had hoped for succour from outside, but the dauphin, though he had gathered some 14,000 men at Rouen, and was being reinforced every day, would not advance. By Sep-

tember 17 the English had filled the ditch, opened several batteries, and driven three mines under the defences. The assault was imminent, and could hardly fail to succeed; seeing this the governor, Gaucourt, offered to surrender unless he were succoured in three days. He opened the gates on September 22, to the great discontent of the English rank and file, who had promised themselves the pleasure of a storm and sack. But the fate of the inhabitants was none the less deplorable. Henry expelled all save the few who consented to do him homage as King of France, and turned them out with no more than what they could carry on their backs. To replenish the town with people he had it proclaimed in England that he would give a house in Harfleur to every settler, an offer which caused a considerable immigration within the next few months.

It took a fortnight to put the captured town in a posture of defence. This being accomplished, Henry held, on October 5, a council to discuss the manner in which the campaign should be continued. Three courses were open to him—to advance against some other fortress of the neighbourhood, such as Rouen, and begin a second siege; to leave a garrison in Harfleur and take the rest of the army back to England by water; or thirdly, to march overland to Calais. The Duke of Clarence and the Earls of March, Arundel, and Nottingham were all lying sick in their tents and unable to move; several thousand of the rank and file, it would seem, were in similar case.¹ After providing a sufficient garrison for Harfleur, the force of the available field army would be very small. No one seems to have suggested that it would be prudent to attack Rouen with the cold of winter close at hand. A majority of the council voted for the safe and unenterprising course of returning home by sea. The king himself, however, sided with the minority, and announced that he should march for Calais. The reasons which he gave were chivalrous—that he wished to give the enemy the chance of battle, and would not go home like a foiled invader. But Henry was at heart a professional

¹ By comparing the muster-roll of the army at starting with the document in Nicolas's *Agincourt*, giving the roll of those who fought at the battle on St. Crispin's day, we get figures suggesting that three-tenths of the original rank and file were missing.

CHAP.
X.

soldier and a politician rather than a knight-errant, and his true motives were probably of a different sort. If he could tempt the French to a battle he hoped to beat them ; if they allowed him to reach Calais unopposed it would add to his prestige, and give him a moral ascendancy over them in the next campaign. It is probable that he acted on the notion that his march would be unmolested, since he bade his troops prepare to move lightly equipped, and with food for eight days only, the exact time in which it was possible to reach Calais. Such a provision allowed no margin for delay caused by fighting or by enforced changes of route. It was a rash step ; the army was small, the country was hostile, the way was not well known, the enemy would be in superior numbers, and if well-handled might have brought the English to a disaster. It was unjustifiable to act on the hypothesis that a French feudal army would always do the wrong thing ; yet this seems to have been Henry's guiding idea. The force with which he started out upon his march can hardly have exceeded 6,000 men. He had told off his uncle Thomas Beaufort, Earl of Dorset, with 300 lances and 900 bows, to garrison Harfleur. He had left in the town many sick, and had shipped off a much larger number to England in company with his brother Clarence and the Earls of March, Arundel, and Nottingham. He did not take on the gunners, engineers, and miners, who would be of no service for a rapid march to Calais. It would seem that his total field army did not amount to more than some 1,000 men-at-arms and 5,000 bowmen.¹

The army broke up from Harfleur on October 9, met with little opposition in passing through the Pays de Caux, and on the 13th reached the neighbourhood of Abbeville, where the king intended to cross the Somme at the ford of Blanchetaque, like his great-grandfather on the eve of Crecy. But being informed

¹ Elmham's figures in the *Gesta* are 900 lances and 5,000 bows. The same figures are given in the prose excerpt printed in Hardyng, p. 390 (ed. Ellis, 1812). St. Rémy, who was present with the English army, says between 900 and 1,000 lances, and 10,000 men on foot. The last is impossible, as only 8,000 archers started on the expedition. The roll printed by Sir H. Nicolas gives (as stated above) 812 lances and 3,073 bows. These figures seem incredibly small, and unfortunately, though the total is preserved, half the contingents are lost, so that we cannot verify the addition-sum for ourselves. Walsingham says 8,000 men in all (ii., 310).

that Picard levies were holding the passage in force, and that the causeway leading down to it had been broken up, the king resolved to cross elsewhere, and turned inland. The march in search of a passage above Abbeville took place under the most deplorable conditions, for torrential autumn rains began. The Somme was in flood, and at each of the limited number of places where roads ran down through the peat-bogs to the water's edge, the English vanguard found that the causeways had been torn up and the fords staked. The enemy was always visible in strength on the opposite bank, moving parallel with the army. "There seemed nothing left to expect," writes one who marched with the king, "but that when we should have finished the remains of our eight days' store of food, and should have struggled on for sixty miles to the head of the river, they would set upon us with their superior numbers and overwhelm a band so small, so wearied with marching, and so weak with want of victuals." Meanwhile there was nothing to do save to press on: on October 14 the army passed Amiens; on the 18th the vanguard reached ground where the Somme grew narrow and was passable at many points, and no enemy was visible on the opposite bank. At this spot, near Bethancourt, the army crossed on the following day, driving off a party of French horse which came up during the passage and tried to offer opposition. The king now turned his course north-westward in the direction of Péronne. That evening three French heralds rode into his camp bearing a defiance from the Dukes of Orleans and Bourbon, who sent to say that they were minded to fight him before he reached Calais. A battle was evidently at hand.

On the news of Henry's departure the Constable d'Albret and the Marshal Boucicault, with the nucleus of an army already collected at Rouen, had fallen back to Amiens and got behind the Somme; it was their troops which the English had repeatedly found in front of them when they tried the fords between October 14 and 19. But this was only the van of the French host; while Henry was pursuing his toilsome march along the bogs of the Somme, the greater part of the contingents of northern France were hastening to join the constable in Picardy. Between the 20th and 23rd a great army was assembled, with headquarters at Bapaume. All the great feudatories of northern and central France were there, and

CHAP. even lords from beyond the Loire like Nevers and Bourbon,
X. and from the eastern frontier like Bar and Vaudemont. Hainault was strongly represented, and the unpatriotic conduct of John of Burgundy (who had sent orders to all his vassals to stay at home) had not prevented Artois from sending a contingent. The nominal command was in the hands of the constable and the marshal, for the dauphin had been left behind at Paris. But there were so many royal dukes and counts present that Albret and Boucicault could not exercise much real authority; Orleans was, of course, a much more important personage than either of them. The movements of the army seem to have been directed in a somewhat haphazard way by a numerous council of war, which not unfrequently overruled both constable and marshal.

On Thursday, October 24, the English had just forded the little river Ternoise, and ascended the slopes on its farther bank, when they came in sight of the French moving in three heavy columns against their flank, not more than a mile away. "Swarming like locusts over the wide fields" they advanced for a short distance, and then halted on the edge of a small valley which separated them from the English. Henry formed his line and prepared to fight. It was at this moment that Sir Walter Hungerford uttered his expression of regret that the king had not with him "ten thousand of the good archers now in England, who would be only too glad to be in his company this day," and drew down upon himself his master's rebuke that "God Almighty is able with this humble few to conquer the many, if so He please". But the French army, instead of closing, swerved off to its right, and went out of sight behind a wood; it was evidently pushing northward, in order to throw itself directly across the road to Calais. The constable wished to receive, not to deliver, the attack. That night his watchfires, spreading far to both flanks of the high road, showed that he had accomplished his purpose of barring the way. His headquarters were in the village of Agincourt. The English king was lodged in Maisoncelles, "only three bowshots from the French outposts". Fearing a night attack Henry forbade the lighting of fires, and commanded strict silence, in order that the enemy might not be able to make out his position. All night it rained heavily, as indeed it had been doing, with some

short intervals, for the last ten days. Both sides were drenched and miserable. The English were weary from their long march and suffering from dysentery; for the last three days bread had failed, and the diet of the majority had been nothing but badly roasted meat, and nuts or unground corn. The perpetual rain had made any proper cooking impossible. Another march or two would have wrecked the whole army from sheer starvation and debility. The French, though not so exhausted, were still in a wretched plight enough; few were able to get cover from the storm; many had sat on their horses all night in the wet; most had slept, as best they could, in their armour. They were stiff and tired when morning broke.

The ground was cut up with woods and orchards, which made it hard for the French to utilise their superior numbers. In selecting his battle-ground the constable had thought of nothing but securing a position in which he could block the road to Calais. This he had effectually done; the two armies were facing each other at the two ends of a narrow parallelogram shut in on either side by the orchards and enclosures of the two villages of Agincourt and Tramecourt. This space, through which the high-road ran, was nearly level; it was some 1,200 yards broad at the southern or English end, and narrower, not more than 900 yards, at the northern or French end. It was all newly ploughed cornland—the common fields of the villages of Agincourt, Tramecourt, and Maisonnelles. It had been sodden by ten days of rain, and was much cut up in its northern part by the passage of the waggons and sumpter beasts of the French train.

Henry arrayed his army in the three divisions traditional in English tactics. Each corps was composed of a central line of men-at-arms, with bowmen thrown slightly forward on its flanks. Thus where the archery of the central division touched those of the right and left wings, two projecting angles were formed. The right division, the “vaward battle” on the march, was commanded by the Duke of York, the “main battle” by the king in person, the left or “rearward battle” by Lord Camoys. Henry hoped to be attacked; he assumed a defensive position, and the archers covered their front with a four-fold line of stakes: for while still on the march he had given orders that each man should cut himself a six-foot stake, pointed at either

CHAP. end. These were fixed, rank behind rank, with one end pressed
X. deep in the earth, and the other pointing obliquely at the height of a horse's breast from the ground.¹ The line was only four deep, and there was no reserve. Henry's numbers did not permit him to form one.

The French constable had to dispose of an army of perhaps 14,000 men-at-arms, beside thousands more of crossbowmen and other infantry. The lowest estimate possible of the total force present must be some 20,000 men; they were more than twenty deep on the small front available. The large majority of the host were heavily armoured knights and squires; the *noblesse* had deprecated the summoning out of the infantry of the civic militia in their aid. Finally none were accepted save *gens de trait*, crossbowmen and archers, with the men needed for handling the train of artillery which the army had brought with it. According to some chronicles these troops, armed with missile weapons, were nearly 10,000 strong—nearly double the whole English force. Yet no use was made of them. The men-at-arms insisted on taking the front places for themselves, and the unhappy arbalesters were relegated to the rear ranks, where they could be of absolutely no use.

The constable, like the English king, had arrayed his host in three battles, but instead of being ranged in a single line they were ranged one behind another; on such a short front and with such numbers no other order was possible. All were on foot, save a small picked body of mounted men, who were drawn up in front of the first line in two squadrons, with orders to ride ahead and close with the English archery before the main body should come into action. The admiral of France, Clugnet de Brabant, headed one squadron, the Count of Vendôme the other. Behind them came the "vaward battle" of dismounted men, the *élite* of the French nobility. It was commanded by the constable himself, with the Dukes of Orleans and Bourbon, the Counts of Eu and Richemont, and the Marshal Boucicault. A second battle of similar strength followed at an interval, under the Dukes of Alençon and Bar. The rearward battle was under the Counts of Marle, Dammartin and Fauquem-

¹ *Gesta*, 231. This device was not tried either at Crecy or Poitiers as some historians, English and foreign, have asserted. At Crecy there was no artificial cover, at Poitiers there were already existing hedges but no *chevaux-de-frise*.

bourg; this corps, unlike the two front divisions, remained on horseback, and was intended for use in the pursuit, when the English should have been broken by the main body. The whole army presented a formidable but unwieldy appearance; "the men-at-arms were so loaded with armour that they could not move, indeed it was with great difficulty that they could even lift their feet".

CHAP.
X.

When the armies were in presence there followed a long pause; each was anxious that the other should attack. Some ineffectual parleyings were opened during this halt. We are told that the French offered Henry a free passage to Calais, if he would surrender his claim to the crown of France, evacuate Harfleur, and release his prisoners. If these terms were offered they were more generous than might have been expected; but Henry declined them, and proceeded to take the offensive, since the enemy would not do so. At his orders the archers pulled up their stakes, the banners went forward, and the whole line advanced with a cheer. It started slowly, the men-at-arms being forced to move at a very moderate pace across the heavy ploughland. When the line had advanced some 400 yards or so, a shiver was seen to pass along the whole front of the French host; it was the lances coming down to the charging posture. At the same moment the two squadrons of horse on the flanks of the front "battle" began to prick slowly forward. The constable had resolved not to receive the English attack at a standstill, but to bring the whole impetus of his vast phalanx to bear.

The instant that the enemy moved King Henry halted his line, and bade the archers refix their stakes. A minute later the arrow-shower was beating upon the French horsemen, with fearful effect. Though comparatively few knights were slain, many horses went down, others bolted to right or left, some crashed back into the phalanx in their rear. Only a very small proportion of the horsemen ever got near the archers, and these were brought up by the line of stakes, where they were shot at point-blank range, or hewn down as they stumbled against the improvised *chevaux-de-frise*. In a very few minutes the cavalry attack was over, and the front line of the dismounted French was coming into action. They lurched forward at a snail's pace through the muddy furrows, all stooping their heads,

CHAP. in order to prevent the shafts from entering at the vizors of
S. their helmets—the vulnerable point in the knightly panoply. Their order was much broken by losses during the advance, and by the heaps of dead and wounded horses lying before the English line, but they at last closed with their enemies, and so great was the impetus of their mass that the English gave back a few paces. But the battle then stood still, and ere long it was found that the French were at a disadvantage; “they were so close and crowded that, save those in the front rank, they could not even raise their hands”. It was not so much the English men-at-arms who brought them to a stand as the archers, who issued from behind their stakes and fell on with their hand-weapons, hatchets, leaden mallets, and bill-hooks. These short, heavy, hacking weapons were more effective against plate armour than the lance or sword; the brassard or cuirass turned cuts or thrusts, but could not avert the battering blow of mallet or axe. Utterly wearied by the long morning spent under arms, and the advance through the muddy fields, the majority of the French knights were physically exhausted or ever they came to hand-strokes. When a man slipped in the mud, or was felled by an English blow, he could not rise again, and at three points in the front of the battle—as the chroniclers record—there were heaps of living and dead Frenchmen piled one over another to a height of five feet.

Presently the hostile “vaward” being all slain or dispersed, the English, weary as they were, attacked the second division. There was no want of courage in the French main-battle, but it failed to make so long a resistance as had the front line; presumably the knights were even more fatigued by the long hours spent under arms than their fellows in front. It is recorded that the Duke of Alençon made a fine fight, felled Humphrey of Gloucester to the ground, and lopped off a fleuret from King Henry’s crown, ere he was despatched. But few fought so vigorously, and the main-battle was discomfited in no great space of time. There still remained the mounted rear-guard, but seeing the awful disaster in front of them the main body of this corps were seized with panic and fled, save some 600 lances whom the Counts of Marle and Fauquembourg rallied for a final charge. King Henry was just awaiting their attack when a clamour broke out in his rear, and messengers

ran up to inform him that a fresh force had fallen upon his baggage train in the rear. At this moment not only was the army much scattered by its late exertions, but a great part of it had turned aside to the profitable task of making prisoners. Dismayed at the thought that he might yet lose the day, King Henry ordered every soldier to kill his captive and fall back into the ranks. Some refused to do so, but the king sent round his body-guard to carry out the ghastly business. Yet, after many hundreds had been slaughtered, it became known that the alarm was a vain one. The assault of Marle and Fauquembourg flickered out, after both the counts had been slain. The attack in the rear had been a mere raid executed by a local squire, Isambard d'Agincourt, and a rabble of camp followers, who fell on the English baggage train, killed some horse-boys and chaplains, stole the king's wardrobe, crown, and great seal, and then decamped, unconscious that they had caused the death of many a count and baron of their own side.

The battle was over, and the victorious army drew back to Maisoncelles and encamped for the night. Their loss had been small. Of the nobles present the Duke of York and the Earl of Suffolk had fallen. The former, a man of a stout habit of body and no longer young, had died not of wounds but of over-exhaustion. Two knights, Sir Richard Keighley and Sir John Skidmore, a Welsh squire named David Gam, well remembered as an old enemy of Owen Glendower, some thirteen men-at-arms and perhaps 100 archers completed the death-roll.¹ Very different were the losses of the French. The total came to 1,500 nobles and knights and between 4,000 and 5,000 men-at-arms and others. Only a small number of these latter (1,500 or 1,600) were common soldiers and crossbowmen, the rest were of gentle blood. The list of the slain included the nominal commander of the host, the Constable d'Albret, Anthony Duke of Brabant, who reached the field, in advance of his troops, just in time to be slain, and Philip of Nevers (the two brothers of John of Burgundy), Edward Duke of Bar, John Duke of

¹ I should have been inclined to accept St. Rémy's estimate of the total loss of the English at 1,600 men, since he was present at the fight in the English ranks, if it were not that no support for such a high figure can be got out of any other chronicle. The figures above (100 and something over) are those of the *Vita Henrici V.*, p. 69; all others are lower.

CHAP. Alençon, the Counts of Marle, Vaudemont, Blamont, Grandpré,
X. Roussy and Fauquembourg, Sir Guichaud Dauphin, master of the king's household, the Sire de Rambures, master of the cross-bows, the Sire de Rocheguyon, chamberlain to the king, and some 300 other barons and knights whose names are recorded in Monstrelet's narrative. The prisoners, owing to the deplorable slaughter made by King Henry's orders, were much fewer; they are variously estimated at from 700 to 1,500 men-at-arms; the most important were Charles of Orleans, who was dug half-dead out of a pile of corpses, his cousin Louis Duke of Bourbon, the Counts of Eu and Vendôme, Arthur of Richmond, brother of the Duke of Brittany, the Marshal Boucicault and the Lords of Roze and Harcourt. Of all the chief commanders of the French host the only two who escaped death or captivity were the Admiral Clugnet de Brabant, who had led one of the advanced wings of cavalry, and the Count of Dammartin.

Next morning the victorious army resumed its march on Calais. There was no proposal made to continue the campaign in France; the force was far too weak to undertake a siege or even a plundering raid, and sickness and dysentery were still rife in the ranks. Henry reached his goal on October 29, stayed there a fortnight to recruit the strength of his men, and on November 16 crossed to Dover, where, according to his wont, he took part in a religious procession and gave thanks for his safe return in the parish church. He did well to be grateful to Providence, for he had risked much in his campaign. It cannot be denied that Agincourt was a marvellous feat of arms, far more astounding than Crecy and even than Poitiers. In those old battles the English had fought in good positions, with the advantage of the strict defensive, the order that best suited their national tactics, the combination of bow and lance. Henry had been forced into the far more difficult task of fighting an offensive battle on a plain level field. The victory had been won at close quarters by hand-to-hand fighting; the bow had only had its chance at the beginning of the action, when the French cavalry were repulsed. Such a triumph silenced all criticism. Yet it is necessary to point out that the famous march from Harfleur to Calais was a most perilous undertaking, and, even when it was completed and the battle had been won, nothing was secured for Henry save a moral ascendancy over

the enemy, which made them as reluctant to fight pitched battles as their fathers had been in the days of Charles V. This was a dubious advantage, since pitched battles suited the English invader, and the absence of them had been his ruin in the days of John of Gaunt and Thomas of Woodstock. The capture of Harfleur was a solid advantage; it gave England a second Calais. But it would by itself have failed to justify the waste of men and money in the expedition. Agincourt secured nothing but the ransom-money of the captives. It might well, if the French *noblesse* had been less hopelessly factious, have terrified the whole realm of Charles VI. into union, and rendered further English invasions hopeless. That a great career of conquest still lay before Henry V. was due to the treason of Burgundy and the rancour of the Orleanists rather than to his own achievements.

CHAP.
X.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CONQUEST OF NORMANDY.

CHAP. HENRY was received in London on November 23 with pageants
XI. and processions such as had not been seen since the day when the Black Prince entered the city with the prisoners of Poitiers. He rode along, as we are informed, with a sober and even taciturn demeanour, as if he were pondering on the uncertainty of human glory, and silently giving thanks to heaven for preservation from past perils. When feasts were over and business was resumed, he received a good report of the land from his brother, John of Bedford, the guardian of the realm during his absence. Oldcastle's rising in Worcestershire during the month of August had flickered out harmlessly, and Bedford exhibited the great banner of the Lollard chief as a trophy. It bore a golden chalice on a red field, the same standard which the Hussites of Bohemia were to carry to many a victory a few years later. Probably some English visitor to Prague told Zizka and Procopius of the device, and the coincidence was no mere accident. Several of Oldcastle's followers had been hung, and Bedford had also burnt at least one Lollard in London. It was no less satisfactory to learn that Owen Glendower had died, apparently on September 20, 1415, about the time of the fall of Harfleur. His handful of followers buried him by night, "and where he was hidden no man may know," writes his follower, Adam of Usk. He had long ceased to be a public danger.

Henry must have watched with deep interest the progress of affairs in France after his departure. After the awful slaughter among the Orleanist leaders at Agincourt, Louis the dauphin sent to the south for the last surviving man of mark of his party, Bernard, Count of Armagnac, the father-in-law of the captive Orleans. Just before he arrived with 6,000 Gascon lances the dauphin died. Nevertheless, the king accepted

Armagnac's protection, and made him Constable of France in place of the dead Albret. Count Bernard was a ruthless, unscrupulous, border baron, with more of the buccaneer than the statesman in his character, who cheerfully took up the responsibility of continuing the war with England, so John of Burgundy was compelled to continue in the ungrateful rôle of rebel and enemy of his country. Before six months were out he had negotiated a private peace with King Henry for all his dominions on June 24, 1416. The war therefore remained a purely Armagnac affair; the constable raised levies to blockade Harfleur, and ordered a fleet to collect in Norman waters so as to cut off its communication with England. But with Burgundy always in front of him, and Paris notoriously disaffected, he could not spare much attention for such matters.

Meanwhile Henry made 1416 a year of preparation, rather than of action. The length and costliness of the siege of Harfleur had warned him that the conquest of France, fortress by fortress, would be a harder matter than he had at first supposed. He prepared to raise a much larger army than that of 1415. To collect the necessary funds he called two parliaments; they sat but a short time, and transacted little but financial business. The glamour of Agincourt had silenced all criticism; the usual petulant petitions of the Commons were no longer heard, and the supply voted—two tenths and two fifteenths—was liberal in the extreme. In the midst of his preparations for the next year's campaign in France the king found time to urge on the persecution of his old enemies the Lollards. One was burnt, one hanged, during the autumn. We are assured that Oldcastle, still lurking undetected in the Welsh march, did his best to avenge his friends by plotting to kidnap the king at Kenilworth about Christmastide. Somewhat later he is accused of framing a scheme to liberate the young King of Scots: he was in communication with the Douglas party in Scotland, who wished to overthrow the Regent Albany, and promised him their aid if he could restore them their young king. It seems that there were also dealings afoot between Oldcastle and some of the secret partisans of the house of Mortimer. But they could have no prospect of success so long as the Earl of March himself remained steadfastly loyal to the dynasty of Lancaster.

CHAP.
XI.

But Henry's foreign negotiations attracted far more attention in 1416 than the doings of the Lollards or the Scots. The most notable event of the year was the Emperor Sigismund's visit to London; that prince was perambulating western Europe for the purpose of strengthening the hands of the council of Constance, which had deposed the infamous John XXIII. and burnt John Huss, but had not succeeded in restoring the unity of Christendom. Till the old anti-pope Benedict XIII. could be induced to abdicate, the work of the council was incomplete. Sigismund considered that peace between France and England would further his scheme, by permitting the French and English "nations" in the council to co-operate more cordially than had yet been the case. He visited Paris in April, and found his proposal welcomed by the Armagnacs, who appointed ambassadors to accompany him to England. On May 1 the emperor, with the French envoys in his train, landed at Dover. King Henry installed him at Westminster, moving himself to Lambeth, in order that Sigismund's retinue of 800 German and Bohemian knights might have ample accommodation.

The emperor came in good faith to bring about a peace. But his task was far harder than he knew, for Henry, though ready to express his hopes for the reunion of Christendom in copious and effusive harangues, did not wish to make peace unless he could gain by it all the exorbitant terms that he had demanded at Winchester in the preceding year. The French, even after Agincourt, were not yet brought low enough to accept such spoliation. Hence the emperor, though enjoying the jousts and banquets provided for his entertainment, found that he could make no progress with the proposed pacification. Henry stated that the boundaries of 1360 were the irreducible minimum of his demands, and the French ambassadors refused to concede them. At last, won over, as it would seem, by his host's courtesy and liberality, the emperor began to veer round to the English point of view, and to find the obstinacy of the French unreasonable. In June the ambassadors returned to Paris, and on August 24 Sigismund, imputing the failure of his diplomacy to the French, signed at Canterbury a secret treaty with England, by which he recognised Henry as lawful King of France, and undertook to help him in recovering his

inheritance. He then crossed to Calais, with the object of persuading the Duke of Burgundy to commit himself openly to the English alliance—for John the Fearless had hitherto contented himself with making a private truce with England. The duke hesitated, preferring secret to open treason, but Henry crossed in person to Calais, to join his persuasions to those of Sigismund, and an agreement was at last reached. Burgundy still refused to sign an open treaty of alliance, but covenanted to make vigorous war upon Armagnac, to assist the forthcoming invasion so far as it could be done without joining the English in arms, and apparently to do homage to Henry as king of France “so soon as he shall have recovered some notable part of that realm”. Evidently the duke knew that he would forfeit the support of patriotic Frenchmen if he committed himself to the cause of the invader. It would be time enough to recognise Henry as king when the Armagnacs had been humbled beyond the power of recovery. Burgundy gave the king many promises, but apparently put his seal to no formal treaty.

Henry, only half-satisfied, returned to Dover: Sigismund went off to Germany, committed to an anti-French policy, and with a promise that the English “nation” at Constance should do everything that he desired. For the future the English representatives stood out staunchly along with the Germans for the demand that a redress of grievances and a reform of Church abuses should precede and not follow the election of a new pope. Unhappily for Christendom the emperor’s Anglo-phil policy drove the French “nation” into the opposite camp: the redress of abuses was postponed, the new pope was elected, the old system was perpetuated, and the Reformation, in the technical sense of the word, became inevitable. For good or for evil Henry of England had his share in bringing it about.

A transient combination of new forces beyond the Channel bid fair for some time during the winter of 1416-17 to complicate Henry’s French policy. The new dauphin John, tired of the domination of Armagnac, fled to Valenciennes and joined the Duke of Burgundy. This changed the position of John the Fearless, who thought for a moment of throwing up his English alliance, and posing as the protector of the dauphin alike against the factious Armagnacs and the foreign invader.

CHAP.
XI.

But this scheme was wrecked by the sudden death of the dauphin, who expired—not without suspicion of poison—on Palm Sunday, 1417. Armagnac had complete control of his younger brother and successor in the dauphinate, Charles Count of Ponthieu, so Duke John was driven back into the position of a rebel, and forced to knit up again his league with King Henry, who was able once more to count on the connivance of Burgundy when he invaded Normandy for the second time in the following summer. He handed over the custody of the realm, as before, to his brother, John of Bedford, and set sail on July 23, with an army both larger and better equipped than that which he had led forth in the year of Agincourt. It is calculated at 16,400 lances and bows, with 1,000 gunners, carpenters, miners, and other men of the auxiliary services. As there was now a French fleet in existence, which had not been the case in 1415, Henry sent a fighting squadron under the Earl of Huntingdon in advance of his transports. The earl found the enemy lying off Harfleur, beat them with the loss of four carracks and many smaller vessels, and so dispersed the rest that the transports were able to come ashore at Touques on August 1, and to land the army without molestation.

Nothing could have been more propitious for the invader than the internal conditions of France at this moment. The constable was in the field against Burgundy, and had not a man to spare for the defence of Normandy. Duke John had invaded Picardy, and induced the towns of Amiens and Abbeville to declare in his favour: he had advanced as far as Corbie on the day when the French government received the news of the English landing. Since the duke was striking straight at Paris, while the King of England was sitting down in a deliberate fashion to besiege Norman fortresses, Armagnac reserved all his force to resist the nearer danger. There can be no doubt that the simultaneous action of John and Henry had been carefully prepared, though the duke kept declaring, for the benefit of his more patriotic partisans, that his campaign had no connexion with that of the English king. It was therefore with the local levies of Normandy alone that Henry had to deal. His plan of campaign for the year was to conquer Normandy, town by town, and there to establish a solid nucleus of conquered territory as a base for further operations. This was

not a showy programme, but it was a perfectly feasible one. Henry made strenuous efforts to preserve the country-side from devastation. Regarding the Normans not as enemies but as prospective subjects, he forbade all useless destruction of property, mishandling or ransoming of non-combatants, arson or sacrilege. Offenders against his "articles of war" were hanged, and the Normans confessed that, grievous as was the passage of his army through their land, it was not nearly so destructive as that of an Armagnac or a Burgundian host. CHAP. XI.

From Touques Henry turned westward against Caen, probably in order to keep aloof from the Armagnac-Burgundian campaign in the Isle de France, in which he did not wish to become entangled. On August 18 he sat down before the place, and began to erect breaching-batteries against the weaker parts of its *enceinte*. On the sixteenth day after the siege began, simultaneous assaults were delivered against several points where the walls had been more or less destroyed. Though most of the storming parties were repulsed, one headed by the Duke of Clarence forced its way in, took the defenders of the other breaches in the rear, and forced them to seek refuge in the castle. The town was sacked, but owing to the king's stringent orders there was no slaughter of non-combatants, rape or arson. The castle of Caen held out for a fortnight more; then, learning that a mine had been run under one of its angles, the governor, the Sieur de la Fayette, offered to surrender, if he were granted a free departure for his garrison and for all the burghers who had taken refuge with him. This was conceded by the king, and the castle was handed over on September 20. On the previous day the neighbouring town of Bayeux surrendered to a detachment from the English army, headed by the Duke of Gloucester. A few days later Lisieux yielded in a similar fashion; the townsfolk agreed to open their gates if they were not succoured within a few days by the constable or the dauphin, which they were perfectly well aware was impossible while Burgundy was in front of Paris.

Henry having thus obtained control of a solid block of the coast-land of central Normandy, proceeded to issue a proclamation promising peace and protection to all the inhabitants who would swear him allegiance. Those who refused to do so would be allowed a certain time to collect their property and

CHAP. sell their houses, but must then depart. Despairing of the
XI. situation, and righteously indignant with both the native factions which had reduced their country to such a state of misery, the clergy, the burghers, and even some of the local *noblesse* flocked in to take the oath, and to do homage to King Henry. He assured them of his grace, abolished the *gabelle* and other onerous taxes, and confirmed the municipal freedom of the towns, though he placed an English castellan and garrison in each.

On October 1, the king's army broke up from Caen for a march into the interior of Normandy. It was a series of triumphs. Argentan, Sées and Alençon all capitulated before the 24th had arrived. The Duke of Brittany made a private peace for his duchy; the Dowager-Duchess of Anjou was allowed to conclude a similar arrangement for the lands of her son along the Loire, which were to be treated as neutral territory for a year; thus Henry's southern flank was secure from molestation during the rest of his Norman campaign. Meanwhile no succours appeared from Paris; the constable was hard pressed by Burgundy, who was joined by the Queen of France. The flighty and selfish Isabeau declared herself the true regent of the realm in behalf of her distraught husband, and published proclamations warning all good Frenchmen to pay no heed to orders issued in the king's name, since he and the dauphin were the victims "of the intrigues and damnable ambitions of certain persons of low birth, who have seized upon their persons and usurped their powers". All the partisans of Burgundy acknowledged her as regent, so France for the future had two governments and two chanceries.

Burgundy disbanded his army in December, but the King of England was not so slack. He continued his conquests during the depth of the winter, spending a cold New Year in camp before the cliffs which make Falaise the strongest of all the towns of inland Normandy. He had at last met an obstinate opponent in the governor, Olivier de Maunay, who maintained the town for five weeks, and, when its outer *enceinte* was breached, retired into the castle, which he contrived to defend for forty-five days more, till its crumbling walls fell in by reason of the English mines. When at last he surrendered, Henry kept him in prison till he had disbursed a ransom

sufficient to pay for the repairs of the fortress which he had so well defended. CHAP.
XI.

Meanwhile the autumn of 1417 had been by no means wanting in stirring events within the realm of England. Oldcastle was busy; we hear of him at St. Albans endeavouring to organise a plot with the Lollards of London, and again at Pontefract conferring secretly with Sir William Douglas, one of the chiefs of the Scottish party opposed to the Regent Albany. By his advice, it is said, Douglas perpetrated "the Foul Raid," an ineffective attempt to surprise Roxburgh Castle in full time of peace in October, 1417. But the bands of the Douglasses hastily recrossed the border when the Duke of Bedford came against them with the levies of the six northern counties. Soon after this, Oldcastle was surprised in one of his lurking places in the Welsh march by Lord Cherlton of Powys. He and his retainers offered resistance, and he was only captured after he had wounded several of his assailants, and had been badly hurt himself. He was carried to London in a horse litter, and exhibited before parliament, which chanced to be sitting at the moment of his arrival on December 14. The records of his old condemnations for treason and heresy were read, and he was asked whether he had any reason to show why he should not be put to death. He replied by delivering an address couched in scriptural phraseology, contrasting the mercy of man with the mercy of God, and when Bedford bade him speak to the point, exclaimed, "that it was to him but a thing of small moment to be judged by men at an earthly tribunal, since God's justice was on his side". Then turning to his accusers he told them "in a haughty and arrogant manner" that they had no authority over him; they were the tools of a usurper, and his liege lord King Richard II. was still alive in Scotland. Bedford would listen to nothing more, and the prisoner was condemned to be hung as a traitor and then burnt as a heretic. The sentence was carried out on the same day, December 14, and he perished at Smithfield, defiant to the last, and muttering something about the resurrection of the just, which dull hearers twisted into a statement that he hoped to rise again on the third day like his Master Christ.

After the fall of Falaise King Henry returned to Caen "to celebrate Lent with all his might, in fasting, prayer, and other

CHAP. good works," but also to wait for reinforcements which Bedford
XI. was raising for him with the money obtained from the parliament of November-December, 1417. Meanwhile he sent out two large detachments under his two brothers, Clarence and Gloucester, to complete the conquest of central and western Normandy. Clarence advanced the limit of the conquered territory as far as the lower Seine; Gloucester entered the Côtentin, took St. Lô, Coutances, and Valognes, but was brought to a stand before the sea-girt Cherbourg, which fully justified its old reputation for impregnability. It was only after a siege of six months that the governor, Jean d'Engennes, hauled down his flag, on September 29, 1418. Gloucester being detained so long before Cherbourg, the king had to complete the conquest of south-western Normandy by sending out two more columns under the Earls of Warwick and Huntingdon, who subdued everything up to the Breton border before July was over. Only the sea-girt rock of Mont St. Michel remained unconquered. It was subjected to a sort of blockade by parties thrown out from the English garrison of Avranches, who built two "bastilles" to face it on the mainland, and occupied the neighbouring islet of Tombelaine. But the rocky sanctuary, whose walls had been completed just before the English landing, remained impregnable, though its blockade was to last for no less than twenty-one years. Soon after Trinity Sunday the king received the reinforcements for which he had been waiting, under his half-uncle, Thomas Beaufort, Duke of Exeter; and with some 12,000 men in all, set out to complete the subjection of Normandy, by the conquest of its capital Rouen, a strongly fortified and wealthy city as large as London, and the key of the whole valley of the lower Seine.

While Henry had been conquering central Normandy there had occurred a complete revolution in French politics. On May 28, the Burgundian faction inside Paris had risen in insurrection, opened one of the gates to a party of the duke's lances, and fallen upon the hitherto dominant Armagnac minority. After some bitter street fighting the constable himself, with the greater part of his captains and councillors, and more than 1,600 of his supporters, were captured and imprisoned. Only the provost of Paris Tanneguy Duchâtel, succeeded in escaping to Melun, with the dauphin in his charge. On June 12 the

mob of the capital rose in riot, broke open the prisons and murdered their unfortunate inmates with all manner of atrocious brutalities. The mutilated body of Armagnac was hung naked on the gallows, and finally buried in a ditch. The Count of Grandpré, the Bishops of Coutances, Bayeux, Evreux, Senlis, and Saintes, and the president of the parliament of Paris perished with him. In every detail this abominable business was a complete parallel and precedent for the better-known "massacre of the prisons" in September, 1792.

John of Burgundy, hurrying up from Troyes, arrived on June 14, before the slaughter was quite completed, and thanked the Parisians for their good service. He gave over the mad king to the queen's charge, and appointed a new ministry, but was still far from being master of France; the dauphin had retired into Anjou, and claimed the regency as his father's natural representative. The larger part of the south still obeyed him, and he collected a new army from Gascony and Languedoc. Even in the neighbourhood of Paris some of his faction were still in arms, and held the strong towns of Meaux and Compiègne. It was clear that the death of the constable and so many of his chief adherents had not brought the civil war to an end. But Burgundy, as representing the King of France and the central government, had now to choose what attitude he would adopt towards the English invaders of Normandy. Either he must stand to his bargain with Henry V., and buy him off, by granting him all that he chose to demand in the way of lands and money, or he must pose as a patriotic Frenchman and endeavour to save Rouen. He chose the second alternative; if he had done otherwise he would have been disowned by the larger half of his own partisans. Accordingly, he threw into Rouen 4,000 men-at-arms, under two of his chamberlains, André des Roches and Antoine de Toulon-geon, and promised to bring up further succours in person.

Rouen lies on the right bank of the Seine, on slopes which fall gently towards the water. It possessed a good bridge, covered at its farther end by a large fort. It had a broad, dry ditch on the three sides not covered by the river, and its walls had been reconstructed since 1410, according to the best military science of the day. There was an outlying hill beyond its eastern front: to prevent the enemy from occupying this com-

CHAP. manding position, a fort had been built upon it, called the castle
XI. of St. Katharine. The houses of the suburbs which approached dangerously near the city wall had been pulled down, lest the English should use them for cover. The garrison consisted of Burgundy's 4,000 men-at-arms, 1,500 Norman lances, and the civic militia, a force which the chroniclers fix at 15,000 men. The governor was Sir Guy le Bouteiller, a Norman noble of Burgundian politics. Hardly less important personages in the defence were two local patriots, a priest named Robert Livet, vicar-general for the absentee archbishop, and a hardy demagogue named Alain Blanchard, captain of the crossbowmen of the militia.

Henry had taken no light task in hand when he laid siege to a town so large and so well garrisoned as Rouen. Indeed, the besieging line was dangerously thin in the whole of its circumference, and did not attain to even moderate solidity till Gloucester and Warwick brought up in September the corps which had been detained at the siege of Cherbourg. The engineering work was heavy—the first great operation carried out was the spanning of the Seine just above the town by a vast floating bridge, which made possible rapid communication with the force on the south bank. Then the king, vexed by the numerous and daring sallies of the garrison, cast a continuous line of circumvallation round the city, with a deep ditch and a high palisade. The place was supplied with such an abundance of artillery that the English batteries were repeatedly overpowered, and never succeeded in making a practicable breach. The only assault delivered by the besiegers was one on the outlying fort of St. Katharine's Hill, which surrendered on September 2, when its outworks had been taken by escalade. Before September was half over the garrison was shut up tightly within its walls, and an English squadron was blocking the Seine below the city, to prevent any provisions from getting in by water. Both sides were now beginning to get anxious; the besiegers because they saw their artillery was useless, and that the town would hold out far into the winter; the besieged because their food was already growing scanty, and the Duke of Burgundy failed to appear.

At last, as October was drawing to an end, John the Fearless began to make tardy preparations for taking the field.

While his levies were collecting he sent to King Henry the Bishop of Beauvais, charged with offers for the conclusion of a definitive peace. But Henry also thought that delay was to his advantage, and kept the ambassador engaged in fruitless discussions, while the magazines of beleaguered Rouen were slowly being exhausted. On hearing that Burgundy was treating with the invader, the dauphin resolved to do the same, thinking that he might enlist the English in his cause by offering heavier bribes than the duke. For some weeks Henry kept both embassies in play, deluding them with courteous generalities, but demanding, when pressed for definite terms, such preposterous cessions of territory that neither of the French factions dared accept them. Peace was far from his thoughts, indeed his real wishes are revealed in a curious speech made at this moment: "It is God Almighty, blessed be His name, who has inspired me, and given me the will to enter this realm, for the punishment of its people, and to have its lordship as king. For I see in operation here all the causes for which a kingdom is taken from one and given to another, and I think it the pleasure of God that such a transference of the crown should be made for my benefit."

Rouen, meanwhile, was beginning to starve. In November the governor expelled from the town all the refugees from the open country, and all the local poor who had exhausted their private stores. Nearly 12,000 persons, as we are told, were thrust outside the gates by force. They were, of course, refused a passage by the English; Henry would not allow the enemy to get rid of their useless mouths. But the Rouennois shut their gates, and refused to readmit the wretched horde. They lay between the ditch and the circumvallation, exposed to the December cold for some weeks, with no shelter and little food, for they could get nothing but grass and the scanty remains of root crops, dug up where suburban market-gardens had stood. All would have perished in a few days if the English soldiery had not thrown them scraps and offal across the palisades, and given them secret doles at night. The king knew of this and connived at it—on Christmas day he even sent them a regular meal of beef and bread. But two-thirds of the wretched refugees had perished before the new year. Their expulsion had only delayed for a few weeks the ap-

CHAP.
XI.

proach of famine in the city. When the garrison were already reduced to horseflesh and bran cakes, the governor, as a last desperate resource, resolved to make a sally against King Henry's head-quarters, while the rest of the able-bodied men tried to burst out by the Beauvais gate. But the plan was wrecked at the moment of execution, by the breaking of the drawbridge under the feet of the issuing multitude. They cried "Treason!" turned back, and abandoned the sortie. A few days later a dog was selling for twenty shillings inside Rouen, a cat for two nobles, a turnip for thirteen pence, and a rat for twenty. Knowing that the city must fall within a few days, Henry broke off his negotiations both with the Burgundians and the dauphin: the debates had served their purpose, and the besieged were at their last gasp.

At this moment, all too late, John the Fearless made one feeble attempt to raise the siege. His army mustered at Beauvais on December 29. But it was ill-disciplined and turbulent, the *noblesse* grumbled at being called into the field at midwinter, and seeing his army beginning to disband without orders, the duke turned back. Only a raid conducted by 2,000 lances was sent against the English lines. It was beaten off with loss, in full sight of the watchmen on the towers of Rouen. This ended the matter. On the last night of the year envoys from the city asked to be conducted to the king. Next morning Henry received them, and—so sure was he of the game—granted them a fortnight to make a last appeal to Burgundy; they were to open the gates if he refused to march to their aid. Meanwhile he gave daily rations to all, even to the miserable creatures outside the wall. John the Fearless sent a disheartening reply, and on January 19, 1419, the English entered the city. The terms of surrender were hard; all citizens who would swear allegiance to King Henry were to keep their houses and property, in return for a general ransom of 300,000 crowns. The garrison might depart "in doublet and hose," giving up their armour, and with them must go all citizens who would not take the oath. Nine persons were excepted from the general amnesty promised to the defenders of Rouen. One of them, the demagogue Alain Blanchard was hanged, for having put to death English prisoners captured during the early sorties. The vicar-general, Livet, who had presumed to curse

the king with bell, book, and candle from the walls, suffered long imprisonment; the other excepted citizens got off with heavy fines. The most ominous feature in the surrender for patriotic Frenchmen was that very few of the Rouennois refused to take the oath of allegiance; they were profoundly disgusted both with Burgundy and the dauphin. The governor, Guy le Bouteiller, set the example to the rest; he was received into high favour by Henry, who made him lieutenant of the city, which he ruled as an English official for many years.

CHAP.
XI.

The reduction of the rest of Normandy took little trouble. By Lady Day Mont St. Michel in the extreme south-west, Ivry in the south, and Gisors, La Roche Guyon, and the impregnable Château-Gaillard alone remained unsubdued. These places all made good defences—Gisors, which was beleaguered by the king in person, held out till September 17, and Château-Gaillard maintained itself for three months longer. Henry made no attempt to push on farther into France till these places had yielded. His position was now so strong that he might hope to gain from either or both of the French factions the terms that they had hitherto refused to concede—the boundaries of 1360, the Princess Katharine and her dowry, and Normandy in addition. Moreover so much of his army was now told off to garrison duty in the lately conquered towns, that it would have been hard to assemble a force sufficient to assail Paris. Bedford and the privy council had been asked to send over all the reinforcements that they could raise, but they replied that men were hard to find; all the adventurous spirits were already over-seas in France.

Henry reopened negotiations both with Burgundy and with the dauphin. But it was with the former alone that he had any serious intention of coming to an agreement. The lands of Aquitaine, which he was determined to secure, were nearly all in the power of the rival faction, and the duke would be more likely to sign them away than would the prince who actually possessed them. Moreover it was Burgundy who had the Princess Katharine in his power, and could dispose of her hand. The negotiations led to a formal interview at Meulan between Pontoise and Mantes, where on May 29 Henry met Duke John and Queen Isabeau, who brought the princess with them. King Charles, being in his normal bout of midsummer madness,

CHAP. could not appear. Henry professed himself charmed with the
XI. young lady, "and not without cause, for she was very handsome and of most engaging manners," but refused to abate his territorial demands. Burgundy had consented to grant the boundaries of 1360 and the hand of the princess, and it was useless to refuse to concede Normandy, which was wholly in English hands. But Henry's terms were always rising; he now insisted on having the feudal supremacy over Brittany, and Anjou, which had been held by his ancestor Henry II., and he refused to exchange his claim on Ponthieu for an equivalent amount of territory on the borders of Aquitaine. Still more unreasonably, he refused to pledge his word that the prospective treaty should be ratified by the English parliament. Burgundy made a great point of this, fearing lest Henry, when he had secured all the advantages he could extort, would find an excuse for repudiating his bargain, by pleading that parliament would not assent to it.

By haggling too long the king at last overstayed his market, and lost his chance. The dauphin and his advisers had been watching the conference with undisguised dismay; if it ended in a bargain, Burgundy and England united would be too strong for them. Accordingly Tanneguy Duchâtel, the leading spirit of the faction, came secretly to the duke at Pontoise, and offered him peace, and the control of the king's council, if he would break with the English and take up the patriotic cause. He struck at the right minute; incensed at Henry's grasping policy, and forgetful of the character of the men about the dauphin, and the debt of blood that he owed them, John the Fearless resolved to break off the conference. He slipped away from Meulan on June 30, leaving Henry in the lurch, and by the time that his absence was discovered was already in open treaty with the dauphin. False, fickle, and cruel as John the Fearless had shown himself during the last ten years, his enemies were even worse. It was their deliberate purpose to lure him to a meeting, and then to slay him, in revenge for the murder of Louis of Orleans and the massacre of the Armagnacs in 1418. The prince and the duke swore "to be good and loyal kinsmen to each other," and "to resist the damnable enterprises of our ancient enemies the English, for the honour of God, the love of peace, and the relief of the

poor people of France". They then departed, each to raise an army in the districts that owed him obedience. It was, indeed, high time to check King Henry, who had now received his reinforcements, and had stormed Pontoise on July 31, thus opening for himself the main road up the Seine to Paris.

By September 1 a large Burgundian army had assembled at Troyes, and a still larger force had gathered round the dauphin at Montereau. Duke John invited his cousin to visit him, in order to draw up their joint plan of operations, but the dauphin declined, and suggested that the meeting should take place in his own camp. Accordingly, on September 9, Burgundy rode over to Montereau with an escort of a few hundred lances; the interview was to take place on the bridge of that town. As he knelt to do homage to his cousin, Tanneguy Duchâtel hewed him down with a battle-axe ere he could rise from his obeisance. One other of the Burgundian knights was slain, the rest seized and thrown into chains. This was on the whole the worst case of "murder under tryst" that modern history records. Charles paid for his foul deed by many years of misery and disaster. But France, not he, was the greater sufferer. It took twenty years of bitter war to undo the results of the murder of Montereau.

The duke's assassination transformed the aspect of the domestic politics of France. Looking round for a rival to set against the treacherous dauphin, the leaders of the Burgundian faction saw that Henry of England was the one claimant on whose aid they might count in the work of revenge. If they were prepared to accept a foreign lord, they could make certain of crushing the murderer of Montereau. Preposterous as was Henry's claim in the eye of the law, he was ready to marry the Princess Katharine, and his sons at least would be half French. Within a few days after the fatal 9th of September the citizens of Paris sent to negotiate a truce with him. He gave them back fair words, but pushed nearer to the city and occupied Meulan and St. Germain. But the attitude of the young Duke Philip of Burgundy was even more important. After assuming the reins of power in Flanders and Artois, he called together, on October 18, a general congress of his party at Arras, at which representatives from Paris were present. It voted that peace should be made with England on any terms that

CHAP. could be obtained, in order that the war against the dauphin
XI. might be prosecuted to the bitter end. Revenge for his father's death was the one thought that filled Philip's mind. During that father's lifetime he had shown some disgust at his tortuous policy, and had only been prevented by force from joining Albrecht's army before Agincourt. His patriotic impulses had now been effectively checked. Yet, as fifteenth century sovereigns went, he was a meritorious prince. Because he compared favourably with his father, and because he was a lenient master and a good administrator, his subjects conferred on him the honourable name of Philip the Good. But he was by no means free from self-seeking ambition, and cannot be considered a specially bright example either of chivalry or of the Christian virtues. We shall be at a loss to discover where his "goodness" appears, when we have to tell the miserable story of his dealings with his unhappy kinswoman Jacqueline of Hainault.

After the meeting at Arras, Duke Philip sent ambassadors to seek King Henry; a truce was concluded which embraced Paris and all the parts of France that lay in the Burgundian obedience. In November the Earl of Warwick and the Bishop of Rochester paid a visit to the duke, who frankly told them that he was prepared to give the hand of his cousin Katharine to the king, and to recognise him as the heir of Charles VI. The dauphin and his heirs should be formally disinherited. This being once conceded, it was agreed that the high contracting parties should meet at Troyes in the following spring, to settle the details of a treaty, and to celebrate the long-debated marriage.

The winter passed by without incident; the murder of Montereau had turned King Henry's claim to the French crown from a thing to be bartered away for lands or hard cash into a tangible reality. He and his admiring subjects at home were at the height of triumphant expectation. The English parliament, which met on October 16, 1419, readily granted all its master's requests for men and money. The only jarring note was a quarrel which broke out at this moment between Henry and his step-mother, the dowager Queen Joan. She was suddenly accused of "compassing the death of our lord the king in the most high and horrible manner that can be conceived," as the Rolls of Parliament phrase it, this is by practising

sorcery to his detriment. The information against her was laid by a chaplain whom she had dismissed from her household. The queen appears to have been subjected to no formal trial, but she was relegated to Pevensey Castle, and shut up there for more than two years, till in July, 1422, Henry, then on his deathbed, ordered her to be released and to be restored to her former estate. After the breaking up of the parliament John of Bedford surrendered his post of "lieutenant of the realm of England," and prepared to cross to France to join the king. He was to be replaced by his younger brother, Humphrey of Gloucester—a change for the worse in every respect, as the nation was soon to discover.

CHAP.
XI.

When March, 1420, had begun, the young Duke of Burgundy marched for Troyes, the appointed trysting-place. Queen Isabeau brought out her husband and daughter to meet him. She made no difficulty whatever about accepting the bargain that Philip had made with the English. Indeed she bore her son the dauphin such bitter hatred that she showed unseemly joy at the prospect of his disinheritance. Some weeks later the King of England arrived at Troyes; he marched by St. Denis and Provins, avoiding Paris, which he did not wish to enter till he was sure of his position. On May 20 he presented himself before Charles VI. and Isabeau; the former was in one of his lucid intervals, and to the surprise of the English "bore himself prudently enough, and like a king". Charles repeated, quite sanely, the greetings and promises that were put in his mouth, and when Henry went over the details of the treaty with Burgundy and the French council hardly any changes were made. On the following day the document was recited and formally signed in the cathedral of Troyes. Henry obtained all that he wished in the way of practical profit, while Queen Isabeau and Duke Philip got nothing save their revenge on the dauphin. Henry, "our very dear and well-beloved son," was declared by King Charles to be his heir and appointed regent, "because we are for the greater part of our time prevented by ill-health from giving to the affairs and governance of our realm the care that they deserve". On the other hand, Henry pledged himself to abandon during the life of Charles all claims on the French throne and to style himself "heir of France" and no more. He also consented to receive the Princess Katharine

CHAP.
XI.

without a dower in money, since she brought all France with her as a marriage portion. A short paragraph disinherited, "for his enormous crimes, Charles, who calls himself Dauphin of Viennois". The most interesting clauses of the treaty were those which dealt with the government of France. It was a personal union of the two crowns, not an incorporation or assimilation of the constitutions of France and England which was contemplated. Each was to preserve its own laws, liberties, customs, and usages, neither being in any way subject to the other. Henry was to govern in France with the advice and consent of the three estates of the realm. The parliament of Paris was recognised as the supreme legal authority, and was to see that nothing but French law was administered. No mention is made of new grants of land or sovereignties to Philip of Burgundy; probably some secret pledge was given that he should not go unrewarded.

If, by some strange chance, King Henry's experiment had succeeded, if southern France had been conquered and the Lancastrian dynasty established at Paris, it is hard to guess how his native realm would have fared. "The greater always draws the less," and the danger was that England might be governed as a dependency of France, and English interests be subordinated by their common king to those of his larger and wealthier continental domain. The danger never arose, because Henry died young; if he had survived to extend his sway to the Mediterranean and the Pyrenees, his successor, brought up by a French mother and French courtiers, would not long have retained both realms. The days were now past when a foreign king, like Henry II. or Richard I., who spent most of his time abroad, would have been obeyed by his English subjects. Henry's dream was a vain imagining, sinning against the eternal facts of national life and consciousness.

Serenely unconscious of the essential futility of his magnificent plan, Henry hastened to complete the treaty of Troyes by wedding the Princess Katharine. The marriage took place on June 2; two days later Henry, the least uxorious of spouses, left his wife in charge of her mother, and moved out accompanied by Philip of Burgundy, to lay siege to Sens, the nearest garrison of the dauphin's party. It surrendered on the sixth day, and the allied army moved down the Yonne to Mon-

terreau, a place which the duke was most anxious to capture, as his father's body was lying in a dishonourable grave within its walls. The place made a better defence than had Sens, but on the 23rd the lower town was taken by escalade. The governor retired into the castle and refused to yield, though the king hanged sixteen or eighteen prisoners of gentle blood in front of his gate to terrify him into surrender—an indefensible act of cruelty. Yet eight days after he allowed the garrison to evacuate the castle under terms. Burgundy took up his father's corpse, and went off to bury it at Dijon; but he left a contingent with the king, who moved on to Melun. Here the *Sieur de Barbazan* and *Louis of Bourbon* made an obstinate resistance for eighteen weeks, expecting every day to be succoured by the dauphin, who had mustered a large army at *Bourges*. But that miserable prince seemed stricken with a sort of moral paralysis ever since the day on which he murdered *John the Fearless*. He lingered hopelessly, outside striking distance of the English, ever about to start yet never starting. On November 17 Melun was starved out; the king imposed hard terms; the governor *De Barbazan* was imprisoned for many years; two monks and a number of the garrison were hanged, among them several Scottish men-at-arms. Henry had sent to England for the captive king *James*, and brought him to the siege, apparently in order that he might be able to accuse Scottish prisoners of treason, for bearing arms against their own sovereign. For there were now many Scots in the dauphin's ranks; a contingent had come over in 1419, and a still larger body had now arrived under the *Earl of Buchan* and *Archibald*, the eldest son of the *Earl of Douglas*.

After the fall of Melun King Henry entered Paris for the first time, riding in state with his father-in-law on his right hand and Philip of Burgundy on his left. Five days later the States General were summoned to meet him; the attendance was thin, but the assembly, such as it was, duly ratified the treaty of Troyes. Henry's personal bearing does not seem to have pleased the Parisians: they thought him formal, haughty, and dictatorial, and French chroniclers relate many anecdotes to illustrate his impolitic arrogance. The main accusations against him are that he failed to show proper deference to the unfortunate *Charles VI.*, and that he appointed

CHAP. several Englishmen to official posts under the French crown,
XI. contrary to the terms of the late treaty. Having kept his Christmas at Paris, Henry handed over the charge of his army to his brother Clarence, and set out on December 27 for England, where he had not been seen for three years and a half. Already men were beginning to murmur at the practical inconveniences of his absence. In the parliament which Humphrey of Gloucester summoned in December, 1420, the houses made bitter complaints that all legislation was now hung up for months while the royal assent was being obtained, and petitioned for the renewal of an old statute of Edward III., by which it had been enacted that none of the ancient liberties of England should be impaired by the fact that the king had acquired a foreign crown.

But the moment that Henry had crossed to Dover his personal ascendancy reasserted itself, the murmurs died down, and in his presence nothing was heard but loyal acclamations. Having crowned his wife at Westminster on February 23, he took her for a leisurely progress through the midlands and the north, and was lying near Beverley when on April 10 he received news of a great disaster in France. The Duke of Clarence, disturbed by the activity of the dauphin's bands on the southern borders of Normandy, had marched with 5,000 or 6,000 men to drive them off. They retired before him towards the Loire; but, determined to bring them to action, Duke Thomas pursued them across Maine, and on March 21 heard that he was within a long day's march of their camp at Baugé. With unwise haste he urged on his advance till he had wearied out his infantry, who were straggling miles behind him when he came upon the enemy. Forgetting that all the victories of the English in the Hundred Years' War had been won by the judicious combination of the archer and the man-at-arms, Clarence refused to wait for his infantry, crossed the river Couenon and fell upon the French with his horsemen alone. But the enemy, under the Scottish Earl of Buchan and the Lord of La Fayette, outnumbered the English lances by two to one; they turned fiercely upon their wearied pursuers, rode them down by a sudden charge, and drove them into the river. The whole of Clarence's force was taken or slain. He himself perished, and with him Lord Roos and Sir Gilbert Umphrville; the Earl of Hunting-

don, Lord Fitzwalter, John Beaufort Earl of Somerset, and his brother Edmund were made prisoners. The French retired with their captives, and when the English infantry, under the Earl of Salisbury, came up at dusk, they could do nothing save bury the slain.

CHAP.
XI.

After this victory reinforcements came swarming in to the dauphin's bands from every side; they forced Salisbury to retire into Normandy, and then laid siege to Chartres, the southermost town which acknowledged the English "heir of France" and adhered to the Burgundian cause. This news recalled Henry from England; if he tarried, the enemy might be at the gates of Paris. Accordingly, he raised a great loan—resorting for the first and only time to this evil and unconstitutional practice—levied all the reinforcements that he could collect, and recrossed the Channel. The last sentences of the chronicler Adam of Usk, who closed his annals just at the moment of Henry's departure, are a witness that there was already much discontent afoot. "Our Lord the King, after rending every man throughout the realm who has money, now returns to France. Woe is me! mighty men and the treasure of the realm will be foredone about this business. And indeed the grievous exactions from the people are accompanied by murmurs and smothered curses. I pray that my liege lord may not become partaker, along with Cæsar and Alexander, Hector, and Cyrus, and Judas the Maccabee, of the sword of the wrath of the Lord."¹ The foreboding was justified. Thirteen months later Henry was dead, cut off, not like Julius by the dagger or like Judas by the sword, but worn out like Alexander by the fever that follows incessant campaigning pursued with a reckless disregard of the laws of health.

Henry landed at Calais with 1,000 lances and 4,000 archers, and marched to Paris, where he arrived on July 4. As soon as Duke Philip and the Burgundians should have come up, it was his intention to raise the siege of Chartres, and, if possible, to force the dauphin to a battle. But the moment that Henry had been joined by Burgundy, and was reported to be moving forward, his evasive foe decamped from in front of Chartres, crossed the Loire, and did not halt till he had reached Tours. The king followed him, capturing on his way Dreux, and other

¹ Adam of Usk, p. 133.

CHAP. XI. fortresses, till he reached Beaugency, when finding it was hopeless to expect either to catch the dauphin or to tempt him to battle, he abandoned the chase and returned to the neighbourhood of Paris. Having pushed back the enemy behind the Loire, he had now leisure to take in hand the sieges of the few hostile fortresses that still remained unsubdued in the Isle de France. Of these Meaux was the chief: Henry sat down before it on October 6, 1421. The governor, the Bastard of Vaurus, was fighting with a halter round his neck. He was wont to hang all Burgundian prisoners on a great elm in front of the city gate, and the king had sworn that he should have no quarter. With this inducement to defend himself the Bastard held out till the last extremity. He was favoured by the weather; a winter of excessive rain twice flooded out the English trenches, and once carried away the bridge of boats which connected the two halves of the army. The besiegers died by hundreds of dysentery and rheumatic fever in their water-logged camps, but Henry would not stir from his post, and when spring came round, and Burgundian reinforcements refilled his wasted ranks, the garrison began to despair. In March, 1422, the Bastard was forced to evacuate the half of the town which lies on the north bank of the Marne; by the end of April the southern half was also untenable, and on May 10 he surrendered at discretion.

The king hanged him at once on his own elm-tree, three other knights were sent to Paris to be beheaded, and a number of the garrison were also put to death; some of these were Scots, who were executed on the theory that they were traitors to their own king, who had been present in the English camp; others were Frenchmen who had sworn allegiance to Henry and then broken their oath; others again were merely men who had made themselves prominent in the defence—even a trumpeter who had brayed offensively at the king from the walls was included in the proscription list. The rest of the defenders were imprisoned, and finally admitted to ransom. The king showed himself more merciless than ever before; he was incensed at the length of the siege, and at the expense of life that it had cost him. Moreover, he was fretful and peevish from ill-health, for he had contracted a dysenteric ailment from the cold in the trenches, which he could not shake off. He trusted that it would pass

away on the arrival of summer, but it grew steadily worse. Nevertheless, he was still able to sit his horse, attend councils, and discharge business. CHAP. XI.

Politically his position had never been stronger; the French nobles were beginning, one by one, to come in and swear allegiance. Compiègne, the dauphin's greatest stronghold in the north, surrendered without needing a siege, so great had been the impression made by the fall of Meaux. On May 26 the queen came over from England, bringing with her an infant son, the future Henry VI., whom she had borne at Windsor on December 6, 1421. It seemed that the perpetuation of the new dynasty was insured. But the days of its founder were numbered; soon after his wife's arrival King Henry's ailment took a sharp turn for the worse, he grew terribly emaciated, lost the power to sleep and to retain nourishment, and found that the simplest business overtaxed his strength. His condition was already desperate when a sudden alarm that the dauphin had invaded Burgundy and laid siege to Cosne roused him from his growing lethargy. He ordered his troops to march for Melun, and promised to follow them in a few days. He rode in a horse-litter from Senlis to Corbeil, where his symptoms grew so bad that on July 26 he had to take to his bed. The army went on without him, and scared away the dauphin, but he himself was put in a barge on the Seine, and carried to the castle of Vincennes, his last resting place.

At Vincennes Henry lay for three weeks, growing daily feebler, yet conscious to the last. He was aware that his end was near, and heartbroken at the prospect of the failure of his great enterprise, for he well knew that although he himself might have accomplished the conquest of France, it was more than doubtful whether the ministers of his infant son would be able to keep up the struggle with success. It was time to make his political testament, and he called up his brother Bedford from the campaign in Burgundy, and summoned his half-uncle Exeter, the Earl of Warwick, and other councillors to his bedside. In their presence his will was revised and sealed, with a blotted codicil in his own hand. He made careful provision for the payment of his debts, and pardoned his enemies, directing restitution to be made to those of them whom he might have wronged. The chief of these last was his step-mother Joan, all of whose

CHAP. estates were restored. Finally he delivered his last instructions
 XI. to Bedford and Exeter, with a vehement declaration that it was neither ambition nor vainglory that had led him into the French war, but a genuine desire to assert a righteous claim. He acknowledged no responsibility for the blood shed in the war, and charged his heirs to continue it to the bitter end. He consigned to Bedford the governance of the duchy of Normandy, and the regency of France also, unless it might chance that the Duke of Burgundy should claim it. If Philip made such a demand, he advised that it should be conceded, for the cardinal point of English policy must be to keep Burgundy on the right side. Humphrey of Gloucester should have the regency of England; Exeter, together with Lord FitzHugh and Sir Walter Hungerford, was to be entrusted with the custody of his infant successor. He charged his council to make no peace with Charles of Valois, "or at least no peace that does not leave Normandy to my fair son as an English possession". Finally, he recommended that the captive Duke of Orleans should never be released from prison till the young king should have reached years of discretion.

After giving these councils Henry "turned his mind away from earthly things," and devoted his failing strength to religious exercises. On the afternoon of August 31 his physicians warned him that he had only a few hours to live. After this he kept his confessor and his chaplains at his bedside, repeating the penitential psalms. When they came to the eighteenth verse of Psalm li. and were repeating the words *ædifica muros Hierusalem* he roused himself, and observed that if God had granted him the conquest of France, it had always been his intention to lead a crusade and restore Jerusalem to Christendom. He did not speak again till he was at his last gasp, when, as if answering some accuser or evil spirit, he said clearly, "You lie, you lie; my portion is with the Lord Jesus," after which, muttering "*in manus tuas Domine*," he "made a most perfect and devout end".

Thus died Henry of Monmouth, whom Frenchmen called Henri le Conquerant, true to the last to the rigid scheme of policy and piety which he had chosen for himself on the night of his accession to the throne ten years before. He had schooled his hot temper to patience and his once undisci-

plined desires to abstinence. Indeed, he had displayed all the formal virtues and some of the spiritual ones. From the day that his father died he had shown himself chaste, abstemious, patient, courteous, a good master and a faithful friend. But there was something hard and narrow about him: he cannot be called a sympathetic character. His ambition was ruthless, and when it came into collision with the dictates of pity or magnanimity always prevailed over them. It seems almost incredible that he can ever have believed in his own heart that his claim to the French crown was sound. Yet he protested with his dying breath that he held it just, and he was not a man whose word, even in a less awful moment, could be disregarded. Apparently he must, by some tortuous casuistry, have argued himself into this strange belief. But the sanctimonious phraseology of his correspondence with the unhappy Charles VI. in 1415 is repulsive; and his repeated statement to French ambassadors that he regarded himself as God's chosen instrument for the chastisement of a wicked nation contrasts most unhappily with the double-faced and shifty diplomacy that he was employing against them all the time. The selected tool of Providence should not indulge in such tricks.

Not less displeasing to the modern mind is Henry's deliberate cruelty. Such acts as the slaughter of the prisoners at Agincourt might perhaps be excused as a military necessity. The hanging of such persons as Alain Blanchard or the Bastard of Vaurus, brave enemies, but men who had violated the common laws of war, was excusable. Nor must we lay too much stress on the burning of Lollards—the work of an honest fanatic—though such a case as that of the twice-burned Badby¹ provokes a natural indignation. Far worse than all these was the numerous executions of persons who had committed no other crime save that of irritating Henry by their stubborn resistance, such as the knights executed at Paris in May, 1422, the Scots taken at Melun and Meaux, and certain gunners hanged simply because their artillery had done him harm.² Yet worse still was the reserving for special punishment of men who had wounded Henry's personal dignity by insults, such as the vicar-general Livet, who paid for his curse by years of

¹ See p. 222.² See Elmham, *Vita Henrici*, p. 328.

CHAP. prison, or the wretched trumpeter at Meaux. Such ebullitions
XI. of spite would be natural enough in an ordinary medieval king, but Henry posed as the mirror of knighthood and the exponent of the Christian graces.

Though endowed with so much ability and so many noble qualities Henry of Monmouth made a grievous mistake in choosing his life's work. No one but a great general and diplomatist could have involved his nation and his dynasty in such an unhappy predicament as that in which he left them. England was not strong enough to conquer France, yet Henry had achieved so much of the impossible that he forced his heirs to pursue the phantom of final success for thirty years of unending strife. And by the time that France was lost, England had grown so factious, so savage and unreasonable, in the demoralising war of conquest, that her people turned to rend each other with that same disregard of national duty and common patriotism that they had been wont to sneer at in the Burgundians and Armagnacs of France. For all this the unhappy genius of Henry of Monmouth was mainly responsible.

CHAPTER XII.

THE EARLY YEARS OF HENRY VI.

THE mortal illness of Henry V. had dragged on for so many weeks that his brothers had time to make preparations for the results of his decease. In France the crisis passed over without the least signs of trouble. Philip of Burgundy gave no intimation of a desire to take over the regency, and Bedford was therefore authorised, under his brother's will, to assume the supreme power. He confirmed all the existing French officials in their posts, caused his infant nephew to be duly proclaimed as "heir of France" at Paris, held a short and friendly conference with Burgundy, and then gave himself over to the duty of attending to the obsequies of his brother. He himself conducted as far as Rouen the funeral procession, a vast military and heraldic pageant. At Rouen it was handed over to Thomas Beaufort, Duke of Exeter, who, accompanied by the widowed queen, escorted the hearse to Calais and Dover. The procession, travelling by slow stages, spent nearly two months on its way to Westminster. On November 11 Henry's body was laid behind the high altar, hard by the shrine of Edward the Confessor, while Humphrey of Gloucester, Archbishop Chichele, fifteen bishops, and all the peerage of England stood around with tapers in their hands "weeping for such a king as England should never see again".

CHAP.
XII.

The change from the old to the new reign did not pass over so smoothly in England as in France. Humphrey of Gloucester was viewed with suspicion and dislike by many members of the council; though his position as "warden of the realm and lieutenant for the king" had been confirmed by the dying words of Henry V., he was not permitted to assume the full functions of regent. His selfish, arrogant, and

CHAP. captious temper had already roused many enemies. The chief
 XII. of them were his two half-uncles, Bishop Beaufort and Thomas, Duke of Exeter, but the Primate Chichele and the Earl of Warwick, the other leading members of the council, seem also to have been estranged from him. They began their opposition by compelling him to summon parliament, not by his own power, but *de assensu concilii*. When the houses met on November 9 their opposition became still more marked. It led to a statute which, ignoring the will of the late king, declared John of Bedford protector of England and principal counsellor of the crown, whenever he should be present in England. So long as he was absent his brother might occupy his place, and act as president of the council. Humphrey was thus made a mere *locum-tenens*, and his privileges were further limited by a proviso that the council, and not the duke, should nominate all the higher officials of justice and revenue. The council in short was to govern, with Gloucester as a mere figure-head. Its members, in addition to its president, were the two Beauforts, Archbishop Chichele, three other prelates, the Earls of March, Warwick, Nottingham,¹ Northumberland,² and Westmorland, three barons and two knights. This formed a powerful and representative body, including as it did the heads of the three families that had been most dangerous to the crown in the days of Henry IV., the heirs of Mortimer, Mowbray and Percy, all now loyal and trusted servants of the house of Lancaster.

Even before his first parliament had begun its session, Henry VI. of England had become Henry II. of France. On October 21 his demented grandfather had died in Paris "in great poverty and half forgotten". It was noted with regret by the Parisians that no single prince of his house followed his hearse to St. Denis, the chief mourner being an alien, the Duke of Bedford. When his body was laid in the royal vault Berri, king-at-arms, solemnly proclaimed "Henry, by the grace of God, King of France and England, our sovereign lord," and the whole assembly present shouted *Vive le Roi!* As long as Charles VI. lived Frenchmen could still blind themselves to the real import

¹ John Mowbray, heir to his brother Thomas, who perished with Archbishop Scrope in 1405; he was afterwards made Duke of Norfolk.

² Henry Percy, son of Hotspur, restored to the earldom by Henry V. in 1415.

of the treaty of Troyes. It was only when he was gone that the Lancastrian usurpation appeared in its full nakedness. If the rightful heir had been a man of energy and ability he might now have found his opportunity. But the younger Charles seemed destined to be not the King of France but, as was said at the time, the King of Bourges. He seemed unable to take any enterprise in hand, and remained the inert tool of the ruffians who had joined in the crime of Montereau. His advisers at this time were Tanneguy Duchâtel, Jean Louvet, president of Provence, Guillaume Champeaux, Bishop of Laon, and Pierre de Giac, four worthless self-seekers, who peculated from their master's meagre treasury, kept his armies unpaid, and used their power to oppress their personal enemies. No one wished to leave the Burgundian side to join such an unsavoury party. Charles himself failed to inspire either confidence or liking. He was a weakly young man of twenty-one, with a large head, short legs, the long nose and sensual lips of the Valois, and a furtive and suspicious air, which (as men noted) had never left him since Burgundy's murder. The cause of the "King of Bourges" was undoubtedly that of the national independence of France; but never, surely, has a good cause been handicapped by such a miserable leader and such worthless counsellors.

Set over against Charles of Valois and his gang was a statesman of real power and untiring energy, backed by an army which had learnt its trade in seven years of victory. John of Bedford was, with the exception of his elder brother, the ablest man whom the house of Plantagenet had produced for over a century. As a soldier, administrator, and diplomatist he was almost the equal of Henry V.; as a man he seems superior, because he was not inspired by the ruthless personal ambition of the late king. Bedford had not chosen his own career—he was carrying out in all loyalty a task imposed upon him. It was an impossible task, but he came far nearer to achieving the impossible than might have been expected. Under his guiding hand the border of the regions that acknowledged King Henry moved slowly forward for seven years. Bedford lacked some of the imperious force of his elder brother. On the other hand, Henry had been detested by his French subjects, who, though acknowledging that he was a great soldier and a "giver of

CHAP.
XII.

CHAP.
XII.

good justice," could not abide his haughty and formal bearing. Bedford, strange as it may appear, was dear to the whole Burgundian party. "This duke," writes one of their chroniclers, "was a strenuous man, humane and just, who loved greatly those of the French *noblesse* who adhered to him, virtuously striving to raise them to honour. Wherefore, as long as he lived, he was greatly admired and cherished by both Normans and French of his party."

As long as Bedford lived the English army was paid with some approach to regularity; pillage was punished, evil governors were beheaded, taxation was never arbitrary, the coinage was kept pure and good. The French archives bear witness to his never-ending zeal in reforming abuses and instituting reforms. France owed him the improvement of the procedure of the Parisian courts of justice, and the establishment of the University of Caen. He was scrupulous in carrying out the clauses of the treaty of Troyes which stipulated that France should be self-governed. In his council of regency there were only two English members to fourteen natives. The parliaments and other law courts were carefully recruited with French legists only. No bishops from across the Channel were intruded into French sees. Of the three great provinces which were wholly in the "obedience" of King Henry, two, Champagne and Picardy, were given French governors. The captain of Paris was a Frenchman, that same Guy le Bouteiller who had once defended Rouen against Henry V. The taxes, no doubt, were heavy, and grew heavier as the years went on, because the power to pay dwindled with the interminable protraction of the war. But this evil had not yet reached an acute stage. In 1423 the Anglo-Burgundian party was high in spirit, and hopeful of triumph. It co-operated most willingly with the regent; whenever a force took the field under the banner of King Henry, the English were accompanied by a numerous and trustworthy body of French auxiliaries. The estates, duly summoned to Paris or Rouen, made liberal grants, and at this stage of the war the money was still forthcoming when it was granted. Not the least successful of Bedford's devices for winning the confidence of the French was that in June, 1423, he married a Burgundian bride—Anne, the sister of Duke Philip, a lady of whose virtues the contemporary chronicles speak in terms of enthusiastic admiration.

The military events of Bedford's first year of regency display the spasmodic and inconsequent character which was the main feature of the five years' campaigning that followed the death of Henry V. But the balance of advantage was on the Anglo-Burgundian side. Bedford set himself to extirpate the dauphin's garrisons in the north, and obtained a great advantage by clearing out the last hostile fortresses of Picardy, where James of Harcourt, the main pillar of his party, was dislodged from the strongholds of Noyelles, Rue, and Crotoy at the Somme mouth. After this Guise, La Fère, and Nesle on the border of Hainault, were the only northern towns which displayed the banner of Charles VII. A defeat suffered by a small force under Sir John de la Pole, which, raiding in Anjou, was destroyed at La Graille on September 26, was of small importance compared with Bedford's solid gains. This untoward incident passed almost unnoticed, because a greater fight, with very different results, occurred in the previous month. Late in the summer the enemy had at last put an army in the field; the core of it was composed of Scottish auxiliaries, who were now drifting across to France in great numbers, under many captains of the Douglas faction. This host laid siege to Cravant, on the right bank of the Yonne, one of the outlying bulwarks of the duchy of Burgundy. To raise the siege Bedford marched in person, with the Earls of Salisbury and Suffolk and a large French contingent under the Marshal Antoine de Toulangeon. He found the enemy drawn up in a defensive position on the farther side of the Yonne; but the river was fordable, and the Anglo-Burgundians waded through the waist-deep water, and brought their foes to action in the meadows beyond. A flank attack delivered by a separate party, and a sally by the garrison of Cravant turned the fate of the day in favour of the regent. Many of the Scots were slain, including Sir Thomas Swinton and Sir William Hamilton, while their constable Sir William Stewart of Darnley and the Count of Ventadour were taken prisoners. The total loss of the enemy was 1,200 men—a number that they could ill spare. This victory of August 1 carried the frontier of King Henry's "obedience" forward in the Nivernois and the Mâconnais: La Charité, the farthest town won, was only a long day's ride from King Charles's capital of Bourges. It is hardly worth while to mention that in October

CHAP. a raiding party from Guise surprised Compiègne, held it for
XII, several months, and were forced out again after the new year
by the Burgundian captain L'Isle Adam, one of Bedford's
sturdiest auxiliaries.

The cordial help given by Duke Philip's friends to the regent in 1423 is all the more striking because Humphrey of Gloucester was doing his best to offend Burgundy. In March this reckless prince, to the disgust of the council and his brother, had announced his marriage—if marriage it may be called—to Jacqueline, Countess of Hainault and Holland in her own right, and wife of Duke John of Brabant. This lady had been wedded to a feeble and boorish husband, the heir of that younger branch of the house of Burgundy which ruled at Brussels. The union, which joined her dominions to his, had been a Burgundian family arrangement: it took into the circle of the house of Philip le Hardi the two most important surviving states in the Netherlands. But after a short experience of the brutality of her husband and the insolence of his mistress, Jacqueline fled secretly to the court of Henry V. in 1421. There she met and was fascinated by the handsome Humphrey, while he conceived the idea that it would suit him well to be lord of Holland and Hainault. Jacqueline opened a suit for divorce against John of Brabant in the courts of Martin V., the pope of the council of Constance. But finding that it would not be granted her, she transferred her plea to Benedict XIII., the anti-pope, who was living obscurely in Aragon, repudiated by all his former adherents. Overjoyed to find some one left in Europe who would recognise his authority, the old man gave Jacqueline her divorce with small delay. The moment that the documents came to hand Duke Humphrey married her; he then began to send emissaries across the Channel to persuade the estates of Holland and Hainault to transfer their allegiance to him from the Duke of Brabant, who was still in possession of his wife's dower-lands. Philip of Burgundy openly espoused the cause of his cousin, and declared to Gloucester and to Bedford that, if war broke out in the Netherlands, his banners would be seen beside those of Brabant. Nevertheless Humphrey began to make open preparations for raising an army to support his wife's claims. If he persisted, there must be an open rupture between England and Burgundy; but for this he cared little,

being the most selfish of men. Bedford, seeing the danger, went to meet Burgundy at Amiens, and promised to do all that he could to keep Humphrey quiet. But he only succeeded in postponing the trouble for a year.

CHAP.
XII.

Meanwhile the greatest event in England during 1423 had been not Gloucester's marriage but the release of the long-imprisoned King of Scots. The presence of so many thousands of James Stewart's subjects in the French army had led the English council to conclude that some measure must be taken to keep them at home. The new regent, Murdoch of Albany, had failed to do so; indeed his own brother the Earl of Buchan had joined the French, and been present at Baugé. Accordingly it was resolved that James should be sent home, if he would give sufficient guarantees for his good faith. The council calculated that he would have enough to do in restoring his royal authority, and would have neither the time nor the inclination to pursue a policy hostile to England. It was hoped that his detention had not prejudiced him hopelessly against his captors. It had not been made unbearable by harsh treatment; James often went about England on parole, mixed in the society of the court, and had been twice taken to France to serve in the army of Henry V. It is a mistake to suppose that he was always pent in a dungeon; though he lacked his liberty and was moved about at the pleasure of the council, his life was irksome rather than unbearable. He had formed many friendships in England, and one attachment that was nearer and dearer than a friendship. It was well known that he hoped to marry the Lady Joan Beaufort, the niece of Exeter and of the Bishop of Winchester. There is no need to dwell on the story of their loves, which James himself tells pleasantly enough in the well-known lines of the "King's Quair".

Murdoch of Albany, the incapable son of that elder Albany who had ruled Scotland so long, was not unwilling that his cousin should return. The realm was in a state of anarchy, and he had no objection to surrender his titular regency. He little knew the stern and unforgiving character of the exile now about to return. With Murdoch's leave the estates of Scotland covenanted to pay £40,000, not as a ransom, but, as it was said, to cover the expenses of the king's long sojourn in England. They agreed also to a "perpetual peace" and

CHAP.
XII.

promised to recall all the Scots now in France. The English parliament received these offers with pleasure, and on November 21, 1423, the release of James was formally concluded. But he did not return to his realm till he had married the Lady Joan on February 13, 1424. On March 28 he reached Durham, where he met twenty hostages of noble blood, who came to pledge their persons for the payment of the stipulated funds. A week later he was on Scottish soil, and beginning his hard task of restoring law and order. "Let God but grant me life," he said, "and there shall not be a spot in my kingdom where the key shall not keep the castle, and the furze-bush keep the cow, though I myself may have the life of a dog in bringing this to pass."¹ For thirteen years James strove to carry out his programme. His axe smote down every offender, the highest even more readily than the lowest. Before he had been thirteen months at home he had beheaded Murdoch of Albany, two of his three sons, the Earl of Lennox, and many nobles more. His energy was reserved entirely for domestic affairs; he kept the peace with England for many years—it was only in 1436, just before his death, that there was friction and open strife between the two realms. Meanwhile, immediately on his return, the stream of Scottish recruits to France ceased to flow, and the once formidable contingent that Buchan and Douglas led dwindled down into a mere handful.

While the parliament that released James of Scotland was still sitting, we hear of the first domestic troubles in England that had come to the surface since Oldcastle's death. Sir John Mortimer of Hatfield, a cousin of the Earl of March, was executed, after an iniquitous act had been passed declaring him guilty of treason for attempting to escape from the Tower. An informer had accused him of planning an insurrection in Wales; it was alleged that he had said that his kinsman the earl "was but a daw," and that under his name he intended to "take upon him the rule of the realm as next heir thereto," and to smite off the heads of Gloucester and Beaufort. Though March would seem to have been ignorant of his cousin's plot, if plot there was, Gloucester accused him of maintaining too many armed retainers, and keeping open house for malcontents in London. He was removed from the scene by being sent off to

¹ *Scotichronicon*, xvi., c. 34.

Ireland to take up the post of lord-lieutenant, and died there before the year 1424 was out, leaving his great heritage, as well as his dynastic claim, to Richard of York, son of his sister Anne and of the traitor Richard of Cambridge. It was this younger Richard who, thirty years later, was to make the claims of the Mortimers once more a familiar word in English politics.

The fortune of war in France during 1424 was an exact repetition of that of the preceding year. Once more Bedford devoted his main attention to reducing the scattered hostile strongholds of the north. The Earl of Salisbury and the Burgundian captain John of Luxemburg had taken La Fère, and were besieging Guise and Nesle, when a diversion was made by the entry of a large raiding force of French and Scots into southern Normandy. They were headed by the Duke of Alençon and the Earl of Douglas, the battered warrior of Homildon and Hateley Field, whom Charles VII. had decorated with the title of Duke of Touraine. They captured the small town of Verneuil, and were lying encamped hard by, when the regent came up with such levies as he could collect, including some Burgundians drawn off from the siege of Nesle. The Franco-Scottish army was the more numerous, but Bedford did not hesitate to bring it to action, and arraying his men in the old fashion, with archers on the wings and men-at-arms in the centre, offered battle on August 17. The fight was bloody and well disputed; it was only decided by the intervention, late in the day, of the English baggage guard, which left its *laager* to make a circuit against the French flank, and fell on just as the enemy was exhausted. The victory was more notable than that of Cravant; the ever-unlucky Archibald of Douglas was slain, as was his son-in-law the Earl of Buchan, and the Counts of Aumâle, Ventadour, and Tonnerre. The Duke of Alençon was taken prisoner. Bedford, in a letter written only two days after the battle, stated that 7,262 Frenchmen had been slain or taken. If his figures approached accuracy, Verneuil must have been a second Agincourt.

During the autumn Nesle surrendered, and the garrison of Guise consented to lay down their arms if not succoured by March 1, 1425. Moreover, preparations were begun for the invasion of Maine, which the English had left practically untouched since the black day of Baugé. But all Bedford's pro-

CHAP.
XII.

spects of successful advance were suddenly stopped by the news that his brother Gloucester had secretly crossed to Calais, on October 16, with his wife and a considerable body of mercenary troops. A few weeks later he entered Hainault, which at once rose in favour of Jacqueline, and expelled the garrisons of John of Brabant. Philip of Burgundy was so irritated at this open defiance of his threats that, for the first time since his father's murder, he forced himself to enter into secret negotiations with his enemy Charles VII. They came to nothing, for Charles refused to pledge himself to give up the murderers of Montereau; but the mere fact that they were made was ominous for the English cause. Meanwhile the duke ordered his Flemish vassals to join the banner of Brabant, and sent to challenge Gloucester to a single combat, with the emperor as umpire. It required all Bedford's powers of conciliation to prevent him from declaring war on England, though the regent disavowed his brother's doings in the most unstinted fashion.

It was ultimately Gloucester's weakness and incapacity which saved the Anglo-Burgundian alliance. When his troops were defeated in several encounters, and the Flemings and Brabançons invaded Hainault, he fled back to England, ostensibly to seek reinforcements, leaving his wife shut up in the strong town of Mons. He showed little signs of an intention to return; he became involved in an intrigue with Eleanor Cobham,¹ Jacqueline's chief lady-in-waiting, whom he had brought back with him to London, and apparently thought no more of the unhappy duchess. Mons surrendered to the Duke of Brabant in June, 1425, and Jacqueline fell into the hands of the Burgundians.

Caring nought for his wife's misfortunes, Gloucester had plunged into a quarrel with his uncle, Henry Beaufort, and did his best to provoke civil war by his reckless and violent behaviour. The bishop was now once more chancellor, and, with Bedford's full permission, had assumed charge of the domestic affairs of the realm. Gloucester left him unmolested as long as parliament was sitting, contenting himself by getting permission to borrow 20,000 marks on the security of the council, and acquiescing in a proposal that his quarrel with Brabant and Bur-

¹ She was heiress of the baronial house of Sterborough, and a distant cousin of the Cobhams of Cooling, whose title Oldcastle had enjoyed.

gundy should be settled by arbitration. But in the autumn he attacked his uncle; he had built up for himself a party in the city of London, apparently by demagogic arts. It was his affability to the commons, no less than his patronage of literary men, which won him the ill-deserved title of "Good Duke Humphrey". Beaufort accused him of having incited the artisans to disregard the Statute of Labourers, while he accused Beaufort of favouring aliens overmuch. It would seem that the citizens were ill-disposed towards the chancellor, and that the duke took the opportunity of espousing their cause and sympathising with their grievances. On October 29 he made an attempt to seize the Tower, and, when refused entry, called the city to arms, proclaiming that Beaufort was designing to seize the king's person and rule without the council—a most absurd charge. Next day he led a mob of several thousand men to assail Winchester House, the chancellor's palace in Southwark. But the Beaufort retainers held the south end of London bridge in force, and after much demonstration and a little skirmishing Humphrey allowed himself to be appeased by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and drew off. The council at once sent to France for the Duke of Bedford, who was forced to throw up all his military schemes and to return to England to avert civil war. It will be remembered that the parliament of 1423 had ordained that whenever he was present in England, all Gloucester's authority was superseded. Duke John appeared in December, and remained at home for no less than sixteen months; thereby civil war was averted, but the advance of the English arms in France was brought almost to a standstill.

When Bedford left Paris Burgundy had long been pacified, the capture of Jacqueline and the complete disavowal of Gloucester's designs by the English government had satisfied him. His friendship being once more assured, the regent had sent out an army under the Earl of Salisbury, which took Etampes, and then pushing forward into Maine captured the city of Le Mans on August 2, 1425. This was destined to be almost the last conquest made in the name of Henry VI. The delegates that Bedford left behind him—Warwick and Salisbury—were good fighting men, but not great statesmen or strategists. The war in 1426 languished on all points save the western borders of

CHAP. XII, Normandy. In this quarter the Duke of Brittany had taken arms for France, influenced by the fact that his brother Arthur, Count of Richemont, had just become the chief adviser and captain of Charles VII., having expelled from the court the infamous gang of favourites who had possessed the confidence of their master since the day of Montereau. Richemont's military career as Constable of France proved, however, disappointing. A series of demonstrations and skirmishes on the frontier of Normandy and Brittany, round Pontorson and St. James-de-Beuvron, led to no result whatever. Warwick held his own, though his forces were absurdly inferior in numbers to those of the constable. He captured Pontorson, kept the Bretons in check, and ultimately induced their duke to conclude a truce. Nothing had been lost or compromised by Bedford's absence, if little had been won. The invasion might recommence whenever he was able to return to France.

Meanwhile he was long detained beyond the Channel. The mediation between Beaufort and Gloucester was no easy matter ; if Bedford had been as firm as he was wise, he would have proceeded to get rid of his brother—the lord-lieutenancy of Ireland would have been the ideal post to which to remove this useless and turbulent prince. But fraternal affection seems to have restrained the regent from proceeding to extremities, and it must be remembered that Gloucester had a following which could not be ignored ; London was all his own, and among the magnates he had at least one ally, Mowbray, the Duke of Norfolk.¹ The pacification of the realm was to be accomplished by a parliament to be held at Northampton in February, 1426 ; meanwhile Gloucester had been distracted for a moment from domestic broils by the news that his duchess had escaped from the hands of the Burgundians, and had succeeded in reaching Holland, where many of the towns had declared in her favour. Seeing that her cause was not entirely hopeless, as he had supposed, he turned all his energies to raising an army for service in Holland. He collected a small force and sent it off at mid-winter, but it was intercepted by the Duke of Burgundy at Brouwershaven, on the coast of Schouwen ; Lord Fitzwalter,

¹ John Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham, had been restored to the dukedom held by his father (the enemy of Henry IV.) in the year 1424.

its commander, was taken prisoner, and the whole expedition scattered or destroyed on January 19, 1426. CHAP
XII.

The duke came to the parliament smarting from this reverse, and in a very quarrelsome and pragmatic temper. Commanded by his brother to bring no armed retinue to the assembly, he furnished his retainers with bludgeons or "bats," a trick which the Beauforts at once copied. Hence the session at Northampton was commonly styled "the parliament of bats". The duke laid a formal accusation of treason against his uncle, mixing up all manner of accusations, new and old, and even going back to the reign of Henry IV. for the subject-matter of his charges. He represented the affrays of October 29-30, 1425, as an attempt on the bishop's part to prevent him from discharging his duties as protector; the affray on London bridge, he said, was forced upon him when he was peaceably going to visit the king at Eltham. Mendacity could go no further. The lords listened to Gloucester's indictment, heard Beaufort's reply, and voted that the regent might accept the bishop's declaration on oath that he had always been the loyal subject of his brother Henry IV., his nephew Henry V., and his great-nephew Henry VI. He was directed to make a formal statement that he had meant no harm to Gloucester's person or estate, and the duke was bidden to accept it. They were formally reconciled on March 12, but remained as bitter foes as ever. Two days later Beaufort resigned the chancellorship; it would seem that Bedford appealed to him to make the sacrifice, in order to cut away all grounds of complaint from under Gloucester's feet. With admirable self-restraint the bishop yielded, handing over the task of controlling Duke Humphrey to Bedford and the council. The parliament was finally dismissed on June 1, after liberal grants for the war had been made.

John of Bedford was anxious to return to Paris without delay, but dreaded what might happen after his departure. Gloucester was reported to have said: "Let my brother govern as him list while he is in this land, but after his going over into France, I will govern as me seemeth good". While he was in such a frame of mind it was necessary that the regent should remain; he tarried till March 19, 1427, and only sailed when he had obtained a formal promise from Gloucester that "he

CHAP.
XII.

would be ruled and governed by the lords of the council," and do nothing without their consent. Beaufort went with him, nominally on a pilgrimage, really to take charge of a crusade against the Hussites on behalf of the pope. Ere he parted from his nephew at Calais, he was allowed to assume the dignity of a cardinal. He had been nominated to this honour long years before, but had not dared to accept it, owing to the prejudice felt against cardinal-legates by the English clergy at large and Archbishop Chichele the *legatus natus Angliæ* in particular. The permission to accept the cardinalate was his reward for his admirable conduct at the parliament of Northampton.

On returning to Paris Bedford began at once to press forward his armies toward the south and west. At first his lieutenants met with unbroken success, and in July the Duke of Brittany was driven to make peace and return from the war. But on September 5, 1427, the English arms suffered an unexpected check. The Earl of Warwick, while besieging Montargis, on the borders of the Orléanais, was surprised in his trenches and beaten with heavy loss by the Bastard of Orleans, the celebrated Dunois, one of the few capable fighting men who served King Charles VII. Bedford was forced to send home the Earl of Salisbury, to press the council to despatch heavy reinforcements for the campaign of 1428. His emissary found parliament sitting, and a lively dispute in progress between the Duke of Gloucester and the ministry. The departure of Beaufort had by no means secured domestic peace. When Bedford departed, his turbulent brother at once resumed his selfish personal policy; he sent money and men to his wife in Holland, thereby risking another breach with Burgundy; he also renewed his claim to absolute authority within the realm as protector, a claim to which the council, supported by the immense majority of the house of lords, offered strenuous opposition.

The leadership of the constitutional party had now passed into new hands; Beaufort was abroad; his brother, the old Duke of Exeter, had died in the previous December; and the Earl of Warwick, recalled from France to serve as the preceptor of the young king in Exeter's place, had to assist the chancellor, Kemp Archbishop of York, and the treasurer, Lord Hungerford, in keeping Gloucester in check. They were dis-

tracted from this task by another quarrel. Pope Martin V. had opened a campaign against the statutes of *præmunire* and provisors, the old battle-ground between the papacy and the English crown, and was threatening the realm with interdict unless they should be done away with. Imagining that Archbishop Chichele had the power, if only he would have the will, to induce parliament to surrender these safeguards, Martin bade him get them repealed or he should be suspended from his primatial authority. Chichele, a weak man who desired peace at all costs, was so terrified by this menace that he actually urged compliance with the pope's demands. But the houses ignored his arguments, and the Commons drafted a petition in which they requested that the pope should be informed that the archbishop was not in fault, and should be requested to annul any proceedings that had been taken against him. An embassy was sent to Rome to soothe Martin, who desisted after a time from his threats and complaints, and acquiesced in the old *modus vivendi* that had prevailed since the accession of the Lancastrian dynasty.

The parliament found leisure at last from ecclesiastical and constitutional controversy, and voted a very moderate grant for the war. Salisbury received an advance of £24,000¹ and with it raised somewhat less than 3,000 men. At the head of these reinforcements he returned to France in the summer of 1428, there to find that Bedford had much work ready for him. The regent had at first intended to deliver his main attack on Anjou, and the captains had been directed to prepare to lay siege to Angers. But he wisely changed his objective after Salisbury's arrival, and resolved that Orleans and not Angers should be assailed—that his advance should be made against the front and not the flank of the French line of defence. Orleans indeed was obviously the strategical point where a blow would have most effect; it covered the chief passage of the Loire, at the spot where the northward curve of that river brings it nearest to Paris. It was the most outlying, the largest, and the strongest of the fortified towns that covered the frontier of the region that acknowledged Charles of Valois as King of France.

¹ He had to lend some of the money himself, on security given by the council,

CHAP.
XII.

In August Salisbury advanced towards the Loire, and prepared for the formal attack on Orleans by capturing Meung and Beaugency, which lie lower down the river, with Jargeau, and Chateau-neuf-sur-Loire which lies a little up-stream. Having established these bases of operations he appeared in front of Orleans on October 12. His force was absurdly small—not above 4,000 or 5,000 men, and could not hope to encircle the whole town; it established itself in two fortified camps, one on each side of the river, but was forced to leave large sections of the *enceinte* observed only by flying parties of horse. All through the siege it was possible for the garrison to make sallies or receive reinforcements, through these gaps in the English lines. Salisbury at first hoped to carry Orleans by assault; he directed his main attack upon the *tête-du-pont* which covered the city on the south bank of the Loire. By October 24 it had been stormed; but two days later Salisbury was mortally wounded by a cannon-shot, as he was reconnoitring the inner line of French defences from the captured fort. This was a sad disaster for the besiegers; for his successor in command, William de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, was an officer in every way his inferior in energy and resolution. The new commander seemed to have made up his mind that assaults were too costly and dangerous; he determined to reduce the town by famine. But this was a difficult task while the garrison could still receive supplies through the open spaces between the English camps. Suffolk strengthened his lines by six or seven closed works or *bastides*, which observed several of the city gates; but even after they had been built it was still possible to leave or enter Orleans without any great difficulty. The siege dragged on from October, 1428, to April, 1429, without any further advance being made. The garrison, it is true, were growing discouraged, not so much from the pressure brought to bear upon them by Suffolk, as from the apathy displayed by their friends without, who contented themselves with sending an occasional convoy, and made no attempt to raise the siege by falling upon the English lines. The only serious effort made by the French was an attack on a small English force under Sir John Fastolf, which was marching up from Paris with a convoy of provision waggons to revictual Suffolk's army. On February 12, 1429, the Count of Clermont, the lord of

Albret, and Sir John Stewart, who commanded the Scots in the service of King Charles, fell upon Fastolf at Rouvray, two days' march north of Orleans. But the English had parked their waggons in a hollow square, and sheltered by this defence, repulsed many attacks, and finally put their assailants to flight. The combat was generally known as the "Battle of the Herrings," because Fastolf's waggons were laden with salt fish for the sustenance of Suffolk's host during the fasts of Lent. Its result much depressed the beleaguered garrison, but encouraged by their sturdy commander, the Bastard of Orleans, they held out for two months longer, and at last, in April, help of an effective sort reached them from an unexpected quarter.

CHAP.
XII.

CHAPTER XIII.

FROM THE APPEARANCE OF JEANNE DARC TO THE TREATY OF ARRAS.

CHAP. FEEBLE as was the English attack on the line of the Loire in
XIII. 1429, Charles of Valois and his councillors owned themselves unable to beat it back. Charles seems to have been awaiting with apathy the surrender of the faithful fortress—his last field army had been scattered at Rouvray, his treasury was empty—there was no more to be done. Suddenly on March 6, 1429, three weeks after the disastrous news of the “Battle of the Herrings” had come to hand, there arrived a strange visitor at the castle of Chinon, where he then lay. A young girl from the marches of Lorraine demanded an audience with him, having a message from heaven to deliver touching the salvation of France. Prophets and prophetesses were a not unfamiliar phenomenon in the later middle ages; sometimes they ended at the stake, and sometimes, like Catherine of Siena, they attained canonisation. Charles hesitated for several days whether he should admit the newcomer to his presence; she might be an impostor or a monomaniac. Some of his more cynical counsellors suggested that it would be better to send her away than to commit the king to giving solemn audience to a hysterical girl. But such private information as could be procured seemed to show that she was neither designing nor half-witted; her absolute integrity and shrewd common sense impressed every one who met her.

Jeanne Darc was the daughter of a well-to-do peasant of the village of Domrémy on the borders of Champagne and Lorraine. From her earliest youth she had been marked out from other children by her piety and devotion. When she

reached the age of thirteen, apparently in the year 1425, she began to be visited by mysterious voices and to see visions of saints and angels. For four years more she continued to work on her father's farm, saying little or nought of the frequent fits of ecstasy which fell upon her, for she was of a modest and retiring disposition. The people of Domrémy, full of loyal French sentiment, though Champagne was within the limit of the English "obedience," followed with keen interest all the vicissitudes of the war. Ere long Jeanne's visions began to take a patriotic turn. The saints upon whom her imagination most dwelt, St. Catharine and St. Michael, repeatedly manifested themselves to her, with messages promising that France should be delivered from the English yoke. When the national cause seemed at its lowest, during the winter of 1428-29, their utterances took the form of a mandate that she herself should go forth in arms, to save Orleans and crown Charles VII. king at Reims. For some time she concealed this astounding command, but finally communicated it to her confessor and her neighbours. She was escorted to Vaucouleurs, the nearest garrison of the Dauphin's party, by her uncle and some other fellow-villagers. Robert de Baudricourt, prévôt of Vaucouleurs, was inclined at first to laugh at the presumption of the poor peasant girl; but like all who came into personal contact with Jeanne, he yielded ere long to the ascendancy of her piety, her earnestness, and her transparent honesty. Taking the risk that he might render himself ridiculous in his sovereign's eyes, he sent her to Chinon, with an escort and a letter commending her to the king. She rode thither through a countryside much exposed to English raids, in a man's doublet and hose of a sober hue, with her black hair cut short and covered by a hood. Her face, as we are told, was by no means beautiful, but she was well built, and had a pleasing expression and a sympathetic voice. She was wholly illiterate, but her language was always correct and well chosen, as if some higher intelligence inspired her peasant tongue.

Such was the personage who presented herself before Charles VII. when he granted her a hearing. She went straight to the king, who had endeavoured to test her clairvoyance by hiding himself among a throng of his courtiers, saluted him respectfully, and informed him that God had sent

CHAP.
XIII.

her to bring succour to him and his realm, "the King of Heaven assures you by my mouth that you shall be hallowed and crowned at Reims, and that you shall be His lieutenant on earth as King of France". Jeanne then craved some words in private with her sovereign; when they had conferred apart, Charles returned with a cheerful countenance, telling his courtiers that the Maid had given him a secret sign which convinced him that she was indeed God's messenger, and had a supernatural knowledge.¹ From that moment she was accepted as a saviour sent to deliver France, and her request that she should be placed at the head of an armed force and sent to raise the siege of Orleans was granted. But lest the enemy should blaspheme, and accuse her of being a witch or an impostor, she went first to Poitiers, there to be examined by four bishops and certain doctors concerning her faith and her revelations. These learned clerks declared that they found in her nothing but good, humility, chastity, devotion, honour, and simplicity. When provided with their certificate, she passed on to Tours, where troops were beginning to collect. On her way she declared that it had been revealed to her in a vision that she must be furnished with a certain holy sword, which would be found lying below the high altar of the church of St. Catherine-de-Fierbois. Search was made, and such a weapon was there found "in a coffer which had not been opened for twenty years". Arrayed in a suit of white armour, with the sacred weapon at her side, and a white banner, painted with the figure of Christ between two angels, borne before her, Jeanne marched from Blois on April 27 to raise the siege of Orleans. She was accompanied by the Marshals Sainte Severe and De Retz, several hundred lances, and a long train of waggons laden with food. Before starting she sent a proclamation to Suffolk's headquarters, bidding the English depart in peace, or they would be swept away by the hand of God, who had decreed their expulsion from France. The herald who brought it narrowly

¹ Apparently Charles, in these days of constant disaster, had conceived an idea that the hand of God was against him, because he was not the true heir of France, the loose living of his mother, Isabeau of Bavaria, being notorious. He had made long and earnest prayers that it might be revealed to him if he were indeed the son of Charles VI. When, therefore, Jeanne assured him, at their first meeting, that she had a divine message to him to have no doubts on this point, he took it as answer from heaven.

escaped death: the besiegers had already heard that "a witch" was coming against them, and were inclined to burn her messenger.

CHAP.
XIII.

Circling around the English camp on the south front of Orleans, Jeanne came down to the riverside on April 29, beyond the easternmost of Suffolk's "bastides". The governor, the Bastard of Orleans, had come out to welcome her, and boats had been provided, on which the Maid and the convoy were taken across into the city. By sailing downstream at night they escaped any molestation from the artillery in the English works along the river bank. The presence of Jeanne exercised the same dominating influence over the garrison that it had already won over the doubters at the French court. The despairing soldiery at once grew stout-hearted, and demanded that the Maid should lead them forth. But it was not till May 3, when a fresh reinforcement from Blois had entered the place, that the French assumed the offensive. On the afternoon of that day a sortie in force was delivered against the "bastide of St. Loup," the most isolated of the works which blockaded the city; it was far up-stream and remote from Suffolk's main camp. After a hot fight Lord Talbot and his garrison were driven out from the "bastide" with much loss. This successful assault cleared the east front of Orleans; Jeanne now urged an attack on the strongest part of the besieger's lines, outside the west gate. But the captains persuaded her to deliver her blow at the "bastides" on the south bank of the Loire, a weaker and more vulnerable point, separated by the river from the English head-quarters. In three days of desperate fighting the Maid evicted the forces of Suffolk from all these redoubts. It cannot be said that she exhibited any great tactical skill in her operations; her talent was that she inspired her soldiery to return again and again to desperate attacks on well-fortified positions, which could not have been carried by any display of everyday courage. She herself laid the first ladder against the great "bastide" at the bridge-head, where she was wounded by an arrow in the shoulder, but she nevertheless waved her followers on to the promised victory, and had the satisfaction of seeing them completely successful. Next morning Suffolk abandoned the forts on the northern side of the river, and marched off with a much-thinned host. He shut

CHAP. himself up in Jargeau, and threw detachments into Beaugency
XIII. and Meung, hoping to make head against the French till the regent should come up to his succour.

The Maid meanwhile returned to Tours, to report to Charles of Valois that she had accomplished the first half of her promise, and to urge him to prepare to march into Champagne, where he should be crowned king at Reims. But the French captains insisted that it was first necessary to make an end of Suffolk's army, which had been driven off but not destroyed. Then followed Jeanne's second campaign—in which she was as successful as in her first. Suffolk had committed a gross mistake in splitting up his small force into detachments; it would have been far better to have retired towards Paris, where the regent was collecting reinforcements. His troops had lost their ancient confidence; the sudden and unexpected energy of the French attacks at Orleans had been such a surprise to them, that they had accepted in all seriousness the theory that their enemies were inspired by a supernatural fury, due to "that disciple and limb of the fiend called Pucelle, that used false enchantments and sorcery". To shut up troops so thoroughly cowed in small isolated garrisons was a mistake; each was inclined to yield when the Maid's white banner appeared before its gates. Hence came a series of disasters; on June 12 the French carried Jargeau by assault: the defenders of the place flinched from the walls and deserted Suffolk, their commander, who tried vainly to continue resistance in the streets, and was taken prisoner. Three days later the victors forced the bridge of Meung, and on the fourth laid siege to Beaugency, where lay the largest surviving detachment of the English army, under Sir Matthew Gough; it surrendered on terms, after holding out for no more than three days. Nor was this the end of the disasters; Bedford had collected a considerable force at Paris, and had sent it out under Lord Talbot and Sir John Fastolf, with orders to join Suffolk. On the day after the fall of Beaugency, June 19, Talbot heard that he had arrived too late to save his colleague. He determined to retreat without delay, but was surprised near Patay by the Maid and the captains La Hire and the Duke of Alençon. They came on with such headlong speed that the English had no time to choose a position—the archers had not even fixed their stakes when the

hostile cavalry hurtled in among them. The combat became a wild *melée*, in which the numbers and enthusiasm of the French carried all before them; Talbot and Lord Scales were taken prisoners, and a third or more of the English army was destroyed. The relics under Fastolf got off with difficulty to Paris. The credit of the victory must be given directly to the Maid, who bade the men-at-arms to charge straight in, while the enemy were in disarray, and not to wait to form any regular line of battle. Whether her advice was inspired by a true military instinct, or by mere eagerness to get to hand-strokes, it boots not to inquire.

Nothing now prevented Jeanne from carrying out her promise to crown Charles VII. at Reims—it would take Bedford weeks to raise a new army, and the way to Champagne was clear. Despite the protests of the king's cowardly and cynical favourite La Trémoille and other doubting advisers, she carried off her master on the enterprise, declaring that a Divine voice was whispering in her ear the words: *Fille de Dieu, va, va, va! Je serai à ton aide!* Her march was a series of triumphs—Troyes was captured, Chalons threw open its gates, Reims surrendered without a blow, and in its cathedral Charles was duly hallowed and anointed on July 17. The Maid stood by him, bearing her banner, till the unction was accomplished, and then threw herself weeping at the king's feet, blessing God that He had deigned to fulfil His promise and restored to France her rightful lord.

Jeanne had now accomplished all that she had engaged to perform when she first visited Charles at Chinon; her "voices," as she afterwards noted, ceased to counsel her from this moment; but despite their silence she gave her master the advice to march straight on Paris, doubting nothing. On July 21 the French army moved out of Reims; at once Soissons and Laon declared their adherence to the national cause; all the Isle de France would have followed their example, if Bedford had not come out in person to check the French advance. He had just received a large reinforcement, which enabled him to take the field with some prospect of success. Cardinal Beaufort had raised 3,000 mercenaries for the Hussite war; but he was an English statesman even more than a prince of the Church; hearing of the disasters on the Loire, he offered the services of

CHAP.
XIII.

his bands to Bedford, and left the crusade to shift for itself. From August 7 to 16 Bedford was manœuvring in face of the French army, along the line from Melun to Senlis. He refused to take the offensive, fearing the demoralisation of his men in face of the Maid's miraculous banner, but moved from position to position as the French circled round him, inviting an attack. Jeanne was for risking battle, and probably she was right, for the English were cowed. But La Trémoille and the other doubting councillors induced the king to decline an engagement, employing the argument that he might gain his ends without danger; town after town was falling away to him—Compiègne, Senlis, Beauvais, Creil—and the Duke of Burgundy had sent to ask for a truce. Bedford therefore was not molested, and no battle took place. Finding that Charles refused to fight, the regent turned aside to relieve Evreux, then threatened by another French force. During his absence the Maid induced the king's captains to deliver an attack on Paris. It failed, for a fortress like Paris could not be carried by escalade, without any preliminary artillery preparation, unless panic or treachery intervened. The stormers stormed some insignificant outworks, but recoiled from the main line of defence—the wall was too high, the moat too deep. Jeanne herself was wounded with a cross-bow bolt, and borne away to the rear. While she still lay disabled the advisers of Charles VII. ordered a retreat, fell back to the southward, and disbanded the army at Gien on September 21. They had witnessed the check at Paris with malicious joy, more content that the Maid should have been proved fallible than grieved that the capital had proved impregnable.

The moment that she had failed to redeem a promise, her ascendancy over the king was shaken, and La Trémoille and his colleagues began to reassert their old power. Now it was at last possible to sneer at her as a hysterical fanatic, and to urge their master to listen to reason rather than to inspiration. Charles was only too ready to do so; he was a doubter by nature, and had yielded to the Maid's ascendancy despite himself. For the remaining months of her short career she was allowed no part in directing the course of the war; but used as a mere tool, useful for stirring up the enthusiasm of the ignorant. She felt that her influence was waning,

but had not lost her belief that she might yet do much for France.

CHAP
XIII.

The results of her activity in 1429 had indeed been astounding; not only were the English driven completely out of the basin of the Loire, but nearly all Champagne had been reconquered, and half the great towns of the Isle de France had thrown off the English yoke. But the actual territorial gain was as nothing compared to the moral advantage that she had won for her countrymen. Down to the moment of her appearance the king's party had been losing ground; it had seemed that their cause was doomed by heaven to ruin because of the black deed of Montereau. Their leaders were contemptible; their strategy unwise, their policy mean and selfish. Hence came the apathetic indifference with which the greater part of the nation had watched the long struggle. But now things were changed. It is true that the English cause had some energetic partisans; there were still Burgundians who could remember nothing but the murder of Duke John. There were a multitude of placemen, lay and clerical, whom Bedford had won over by his wise policy of governing France through Frenchmen. A considerable body of professional soldiers were kept faithful to the English banner by the memory of old triumphs, and the high pay punctually dealt out by the regent. In Paris the university, always a focus of Burgundian influence, was still loyal to the English connexion, as were also most of the higher clergy. But there comes a moment when the partisan who has been bought over to a cause in which he feels nothing but a selfish interest, begins to question with himself whether it is worth while to fight any longer against the inevitable—and in France from 1429 onward that which now seemed inevitable was not the expulsion of Charles VII. from the south, but the expulsion of the English from the north. The men of material interests began to doubt the wisdom of adhering any longer to the losing party. From this time forward they began slowly but steadily to drift over to the national side. As to the rank and file, whose patriotic sentiment was not restrained by any sordid personal interest, they had been so shamed by the Maid's valiant championship of the cause which they had abandoned as lost, so convinced of her inspiration by the magnificence of her success, that for the

CHAP.
XIII.

future no town in the English "obedience" could be kept loyal save by the presence of an English or a Burgundian garrison. Where no such garrison was forthcoming the gates flew open of their own accord, at the first appearance of the banner of the Lilies.

This much France owed to Jeanne Darc. That she did not owe yet more was due to the doubting hesitancy of Charles VII. and the criminal perversity of his councillors. But La Trémoille and his friends did Bedford's work, and half-arrested the onrush of the torrent which might otherwise have swept the English out of France. Twenty years more of dismal wasting war were required to complete the expulsion of the stranger, because the opportune moment was missed. The panic-stricken soldiery of Bedford recovered their confidence, new reinforcements were hurried over from England, and in the long winter months, while Jeanne was being kept idle at Bourges, Orleans, or Chinon, the regent organised a fresh line of defence.

England had been profoundly stirred up by the news of the Maid's successes. After her first exploits at Orleans Bedford had written to the council, to urge that the young king should be brought over to France, in order that the sight of his tender youth might appeal to the loyalty of his subjects. He had never yet been seen in his French realm. Bedford urged that he should be conducted to Paris and there crowned with all ceremony after the native fashion. The council agreed, and resolved that he should also be crowned King of England before his departure. In face of the series of disasters on the Loire and the subsequent appearance of the French close to the gates of Paris, no attempt was made to move the little lad during the summer of 1429. But when La Trémoille had disbanded the army of Charles VII. and retired to the south, it was resolved that it would be safe to bring the king over in the spring of 1430. Meanwhile parliament met on September 22, and the English coronation of Henry VI. was performed on November 6. Though he was only eight years of age, the council took the opportunity of declaring that he no longer required a "Protector," and Gloucester was deprived of the office which he had so long abused, though he was continued as "chief councillor" of his little nephew. He had spent his last year of protectorship in another series of quarrels with Beaufort, which

only came to an end when the cardinal carried off his "crusading" levies to France, and diverted them to the strengthening of Bedford's army.

To escort the king to Paris what passed for a large force in the England of those days was raised, 1,200 lances and 3,500 bows. The parliament reassembled after Christmas to vote liberal supplies for its equipment, and to discuss much other business, for this was a long session. It had some constitutional importance, for in it was passed the statute that settled for some four centuries the character of the constituencies which were to choose the knights of the shire, the most important element in the house of commons. Hitherto all men whose tenure required them to do so, were theoretically supposed to attend the county court when an election was on hand; now it was enacted that no one under the status of a freeholder with land to the annual value of forty shillings should exercise the suffrage. The excuse given was that a rabble of poverty-stricken peasants might swamp the solid landed yeomen of the shire. Probably some turbulent scenes had occurred of late, and moved the wrath of the governing classes. The statute appears oligarchic in its tendency, but had less real effect in destroying the representative character of the county court than appears on the face of it.¹ For whoever were the voters, the local magnates possessed already, and continued to possess for the future, the real deciding voice at the elections. Except when the sheriff, acting under the pressure of king and council ignored all voters whatsoever, and returned some crown nominee the great landowners of the neighbourhood practically chose the knights of the shire, and it mattered little whether their choice was ratified by a smaller body of forty-shilling freeholders or by a larger body of poorer men. The head of the house of Mowbray practically chose the members for Norfolk, the head of the house of Percy, the members for Northumberland, whether the number of voters was small or great. In shires where there was no single dominating influence there might be, and were, contested elections,² but this was the exception rather than the rule.

¹ For all this question see Stubbs' *Constitutional History*, iii., 420-46.

² See the case of the Huntingdonshire election of 1450 discussed by Stubbs, *ibid.*, p. 442.

CHAP.
XIII.

While the English council prepared for the despatch of the king and his army to France, Bedford did his best to repair his shattered line of defence. He had no illusions as to the unsoundness of his position; indeed his action shows that he was already contemplating the possibility of having to abandon Paris and retire into Normandy. But ere resigning himself to this humiliating necessity he appealed to the cupidity of Philip of Burgundy. The duke was already coquetting with the enemy; it was a matter of sinister significance that he had already concluded a private truce with King Charles in July, and had renewed it up to Christmas day. But in October Bedford bribed him to stand fast to the English cause, by making over to him the government of the districts of Melun, Sens, Chartres, Amiens, the Vermandois, and Ponthieu, together with the charge of the city of Paris. The remnant of Champagne still acknowledging King Henry's supremacy, and the whole of Picardy, were thus ceded to Burgundy. Paris received as governor the *Sieur de L'Isle Adam*, the duke's most trusted captain. Once more Philip was secured as a firm ally, and in the ensuing campaign his levies played the leading part, while the English confined themselves almost entirely to the defence of Normandy.

When the campaigning season of 1430 came round, Philip sent John of Luxemburg to lay siege to Compiègne, a fortress which was of all the recent conquests of the French the one most inconvenient to the Anglo-Burgundian allies, as it blocked the main road from Paris to Picardy. On March 28, the Maid had broken away from the restraint placed upon her by her master's councillors, and had made her way to the seat of war. Hearing that Compiègne was in danger, she threw herself into the place at the head of a small relieving force. Convinced that audacity was the only true policy, she planned a sortie against the Burgundian lines on May 23. Her sudden attack was at first successful, but as the enemy came hurrying up from all quarters, she and a small body of her followers were cut off from the town. Jeanne tried to force her way back, but was unhorsed and captured by a retainer of John of Luxemburg.

The rest of the Maid's short tale is heartrending. The Burgundian, after much thrifty haggling, sold her to the English for 10,000 gold francs. Bedford had resolved to make an

example of her, vainly trusting that he might undo her work by branding her as a sorceress and sending her to the stake. He found eager and willing tools among the doctors of the University of Paris, and the clergy of the Anglo-Burgundian faction. Jeanne's capture had taken place in the diocese of Beauvais; its bishop, Pierre Cauchon, demanded that she should be handed over to him for trial. After some delay she was brought to Rouen, and arraigned before a court consisting of the bishop, the vicar of the Inquisition, and a number of doctors of the University of Paris; the whole tribunal was composed of native Frenchmen. They conducted her examination with much deliberation and minute care, in February, March and April, 1431. The Maid replied to their questions with great simplicity and candour, describing with perfect conviction her visions of St. Michael, St. Katharine, and St. Margaret, their promises to her and their prophecies. She also spoke much of her "voices": they gave her counsel as to what she was to do and what to shun in most of the crises of her life. Even in her prison they had not deserted her, but had bade her answer boldly and trust in God.

On May 23 the inquisitors resolved that Jeanne was a false prophetess, and her visions delusions of Satan. When she refused to submit to their decision or to own herself deluded, she was threatened with torture, grossly misused and insulted by her jailers, and finally told to prepare for death. On the 24th, she was again brought before her judges, among whom on this one occasion sat Cardinal Beaufort and Bishop Alnewick of Norwich, the only Englishmen who appeared in this black business. Bishop Cauchon announced that unless she made her submission she should be burnt that very day. Broken by long imprisonment, the strain of a trial that had lasted three months, much fasting, and much evil treatment by her keepers, the Maid broke down, and set her mark to a document in which she owned that her visions were delusions, and that she had erred grievously in wearing male apparel and serving in the wars. She was thereupon condemned to close imprisonment and perpetual penance. She assumed woman's garb, and was taken back to prison; but only four days later she was declared to have relapsed and broken her pledges. The "relapse" consisted in nothing more than the resumption of her

CHAP.
XIII.

male garments—to which she had been practically constrained by the lewd insults of her jailers—and an assertion that St. Katharine and St. Margaret had visited her, and had reproached her for denying her mission and forgetting her trust in God. For these offences the hastily reassembled court declared Jeanne a relapsed heretic, and sentenced her to the stake. The whole trial had been conducted with an obvious desire to secure an execution. Jeanne was burnt in the old market-place of Rouen on May 29, protesting to the last her conviction that she had been God's messenger to the people of France, and commending her soul to Christ and the saints as the flames closed over her. History records few more odious scenes than the martyrdom of this unhappy and heroic girl of eighteen, the victim of Bedford's hard heart and the cruel spite of his French subordinates. Yet of all concerned in her death her master Charles VII. cuts the worst figure; he made no attempt whatever to deliver her, though he could undoubtedly have saved her life by threatening to retaliate on his numerous English prisoners—he had still in his hands Lord Talbot and many other knights and nobles captured at Jargeau and Patay. But Jeanne had served her purpose, and the French court felt no further interest in her.

While the long tragedy at Rouen was in progress the Burgundians recovered Soissons, and the English recaptured Aumâle and Château-Gaillard, though Compiègne was saved by the Marshal de Boussac in November, 1430. Thus the fortress for which the Maid had sacrificed herself did not fall into the hands of her enemies. Meanwhile King Henry, after a stay of three months at Calais, was brought down to Rouen, where he was abiding all through Jeanne's long trial. The nemesis due for her martyrdom fell on the head of the innocent boy for whose profit that atrocity was perpetrated. Bedford and Beaufort and the odious Bishop of Beauvais died in their beds; it was Henry who paid by long years of frustrated hopes, by poverty and prison, by a bloody death, for the unrighteous end of the Maid of Orleans. Some months after that event Bedford, having subdued all the revolted towns on the way from Rouen to Paris, brought his nephew to the French capital. There he was crowned on December 16, 1431, by his uncle Beaufort. Hardly any of the French nobles of the Burgundian

faction and very few of the native clergy were present. The ceremony appeared to lookers-on to be a purely English affair. Certainly it had no such influence on public opinion beyond the Channel as Bedford had hoped. Ten days after his coronation the king was sent back to England : the Parisians murmured that his presence in their midst had been celebrated neither by a remission of taxes nor an amnesty to prisoners, in the style customary with monarchs making their first appearance in their capital.

CHAP.
XIII.

During the long absence of Henry from England, between May, 1430, and February, 1432, Gloucester seems to have recovered some of his former authority—it must be remembered that Beaufort, Warwick, and other members of the council were overseas. He spent most of his energy in preparing a warm reception for his uncle, when he should return. He maintained that Beaufort would have to resign his see of Winchester, because he had accepted a cardinal's hat, and he also prepared a writ of *premunire* against him, for having obtained a papal bull exempting him from the metropolitan jurisdiction of Canterbury. It was with difficulty that he was persuaded to defer its execution till the king and the cardinal should have returned to England. The main incident which distracted Gloucester's attention from these factious devices was an abortive Lollard rising—one of the most obscure events in this obscure time. The burning of heretics had gone on fitfully ever since the death of Henry V., and the more desperate Lollards, impotent though they were because of their small numbers, seem to have been ready for mischief. One William Perkins, bailiff of Abingdon, was detected putting about seditious bills in the name of "Jack Sharp of Wigmoreland," a name pointing to adherence to the old cause of the Mortimers, whose greatest castle was Wigmore. He is said to have collected "a meinie of risers against men of Holy Church" at Abingdon; of their numbers or their plans we can discover little—they certainly proposed a confiscation of Church property, and, according to their enemies, said "that they would have three priests' heads for a penny". Gloucester thought the affair sufficiently serious to compel him to raise an armed force and ride in haste to Abingdon. Many Lollards were seized there; Perkins and five others were hanged, drawn, and quartered as traitors at Oxford, and others of his confederates were executed at Coventry and London.

CHAP.
XIII.

After the young king came home in February, 1432, while Beaufort was still lingering abroad, Gloucester carried out a complete change of ministry, displacing Archbishop Kemp and Lord Hungerford from the chancery and treasury, in favour of Bishop Stafford of Bath and Lord Scales, and removing also the young king's chamberlain and steward. When parliament met, however, the cardinal returned to England, and joined battle with his nephew, but shortly after was recalled to the continent, where he was required to sit in the newly summoned Council of Bâle. This only put off the struggle. Meanwhile Bedford was still unable to leave France to restrain his brother; his difficulties were much increased by the fact that Philip of Burgundy had now made a private truce for two years with Charles VII., so that the French were able to turn all their energies against the English forces in Normandy and the Isle de France. A daring attempt of the Marshal de Boussac to surprise Rouen only just failed of success in March; in April the Bastard of Orleans captured the great town of Chartres by stratagem. In August Bedford in person was driven off from the siege of Lagny-sur-Marne, which he had kept up for three months. He returned to Paris sick and disheartened, and there suffered a far worse blow; his excellent wife, Anne of Burgundy, died on October 13. Thus he lost not only a faithful helpmeet, but the one person who kept tight the bonds of friendship between England and Burgundy. Duke Philip had begun to make up his mind that war could bring him no further gain in France, and that he might sell peace at a good price to King Charles. He had brought English and French envoys together and urged concessions, but Bedford would not listen to any proposal for giving up Paris, or surrendering his little nephew's title as King of France, demands which the envoys of Charles VII. were now set upon enforcing, and the conference came to nothing.

In the ensuing year the French made a bold advance in the direction of the duchy of Burgundy, capturing Avalon and Vézelay, and overrunning all the Nivernais and the Maconnais. This was a most unwise move, as an attack on his personal possessions was the one thing which was certain to throw back Duke Philip into the arms of the English. For the last time he took the field in person, and entered Champagne at the head of a great army from his Netherland dominions, with which he

retook several of the lost towns, and finally made his way to Dijon. The French fell back in every direction before him. Meanwhile the English army in Normandy and Picardy, strengthened with new Burgundian levies, made a good front against the enemy, and recovered St. Valéry and several other places.

CHAP
XIII.

This was to be the last campaign in which fortune seemed for a moment to smile upon the cause of King Henry VI. Its brilliant start enabled the regent to make a visit to England; Beaufort accompanied him. Bedford's influence was at once displayed by the restoration of some of the cardinal's friends to office; Ralph Lord Cromwell became treasurer, and the Earl of Suffolk was made steward of the king's household. Thus the ministry was no longer entirely composed of partisans of Gloucester. The Commons put in a petition, couched in the strongest terms, begging that Bedford might remain in England "for its restful rule and governance," and he was inclined to accept the offer. His health was in a very unsatisfactory condition, and he needed rest from his endless campaigning. Moreover he had just wedded a new wife—Jacquette, daughter of the Count of St. Pol, and niece both of his French chancellor, the Bishop of Therouanne, and of John of Luxemburg, the greatest of the captains of Philip of Burgundy. Apparently Bedford had hoped to bind her relatives more closely to his cause by this marriage; he did not foresee that it would be taken in evil part by Burgundy himself. But, either because he had not been consulted in the matter, or because he disliked seeing his dead sister given a successor at such short notice, or merely because he was ready to snatch at any excuse for deserting the English faction, Philip professed himself much offended at the match. Despite of this ominous estrangement, Bedford accepted the proposal that he should remain in England, and take up the regency. Parliament renewed to him all the powers with which he had been entrusted in 1422, though it refused to grant such heavy supplies as he craved for the French war. But in June, 1434, he announced that things were going so badly across the Channel that he was forced to depart. He was drawn away not by the movements of the French army, which was being well contained for the moment by Lord Talbot in the Isle de France and by the Earl of Arundel in Maine, but

CHAP. by a new development, a general rising of the peasantry of
XIII. Normandy against the English garrisons. The duchy had remained in a state of almost complete apathy since its conquest by Henry V. fourteen years back ; that it should now revolt was a symptom of the most sinister significance. The original provoking cause had been atrocities committed by one Richard Venables, a captain of free lances in lower Normandy. But though his misconduct was punished by prompt execution, the insurrection continued. Bedford spent six months in the duchy, trying all the resources of force and conciliation ; many rebel bands were cut to pieces, others driven out of the land, yet Normandy was still incompletely pacified when the duke passed on to Paris in December, 1434.

His presence there was imperative, for Philip of Burgundy had made a new truce with the enemy, and the whole stress of the war was about to be thrown once more upon the small English army and its ever-dwindling band of French auxiliaries. When the Burgundians were in the field the game could still be kept up, but when they withdrew from the war at the beginning of the winter, the regent saw that with a total force of some 8,000 men, scattered in small detachments about Normandy and Picardy, Maine and the Isle de France, he could hardly hope to face another campaign without the certainty of disaster. He stopped two months in Paris, striving apparently to rally his French adherents for a final effort, and wrote to the English council pressing for reinforcements on a large scale. But the Parisians, even those most deeply committed to the cause of King Henry, had grown hopeless. The city was in a most deplorable state : the French garrisons of Beauvais and Compiègne, Melun, and Senlis had harried bare the whole countryside around the capital. Famine had made a permanent home within its walls, though Bedford had arranged for the despatch of frequent convoys of food from Normandy ; grass was growing in the streets, whole quarters were lying desolate, and wolves were actually seen that winter roaming in the once populous suburbs. The regent's most faithful supporters could give him no hope of support ; every burgess was longing for the inevitable re-entry of the troops of Charles VII., as the only event which could save Paris from slow extinction. Recognising that the loss of the city was inevitable, Bedford retired

to Rouen in February. After his departure Burgundy, still nominally an ally of the English cause, passed through Paris, and frankly told the council that he had resolved to make peace with the French, and that no peace would be possible unless Paris was given up, and King Henry's claim to the French crown abandoned. After delivering this comfortless message he went on his way.

When he had concluded his private truce with Charles VII. in the previous December, Philip had committed himself to much more than a mere suspension of arms. He had undertaken to use all his influence with the English government to bring about a general peace. And if no peace on what he considered reasonable terms could be obtained, he had promised to abandon his old allies and take sides openly with Charles VII. Naturally he was to be well paid; he covenanted that he was to receive the whole of the royal demesne lands upon the Somme, Ponthieu, Abbeville, Amiens, St. Quentin, and Corbie, with Montreuil and Doullens—in short, the whole of Picardy. Philip made no secret of his engagements, and invited the English council to send ambassadors to Arras, and to make up their minds to accept honourable terms; if they proved unreasonable he would be forced to become their enemy. About the same time emissaries arrived in London from the pope and the council of Bâle, who begged that such a splendid chance for securing the pacification of Christendom should not be sacrificed to any foolish national pride. It was impossible to refuse Burgundy's mediation, and Cardinal Beaufort, Kemp Archbishop of York, and the Earls of Suffolk and Huntingdon were designated as plenipotentiaries on behalf of England, and appeared at Arras in July.

Meanwhile the negotiations did not suspend the progress of hostilities in France. The campaign of 1435 took a disastrous turn from the first; early in May the Earl of Arundel, who was now commanding in northern Normandy, received a crushing defeat at Gerberoi, near Beauvais, at the hands of the French captains La Hire and Pothon de Xaintrailles; his little army was cut to pieces, and he himself mortally wounded and taken prisoner. In consequence of this disaster the enemy got possession of Rue, Etaples, and several other places. A month later, on June 1, La Hire and the Bastard of Orleans surprised

CHAP. St. Denis, and thus established themselves at the very gates of
XIII. Paris; it seemed as if it required but one push more to enable them to win the capital itself. But Bedford collected every man that could be raised in Normandy, and sent his last army under the Lords Talbot, Scales, and Willoughby to recover St. Denis. They were beleaguering the place all through the months while the congress of Arras was in session.

There was never any great prospect that this meeting would lead to a general peace. The English ambassadors had received instructions which forbade them to surrender King Henry's claim to the crown of France. Their first offers were absurd, considering the situation of affairs; Charles of Valois might have peace on surrendering all his domains north of the Loire—all in fact that the Maid of Orleans had won back for France. To this the French replied with an almost equally unreasonable proposal; the English should evacuate Paris, Normandy, and all their northern possessions, abandon their king's French title, and receive as compensation Perigord, Quercy, the Limousin, and certain other small districts on the borders of Guienne, with 600,000 crowns in money. Each party laughed the other's proffer to scorn, but haggling began, and continued for some weeks, till the French produced their ultimatum: King Henry should keep Normandy, and receive the hand of one of the daughters of Charles VII., in return for giving up his claim to the French crown, and evacuating Paris and the other outlying towns in the north where his banner was still flying. The English envoys would offer nothing more than the territorial *status quo*, which would leave them Paris, Maine, and the greater part of the Isle de France; they refused even to discuss the question of the resignation of the French title by their young king.

Matters had thus come to a deadlock, and on September 6 Beaufort and his colleagues departed from Arras. Considering the military situation of the moment, the conduct of the English government must be pronounced absolutely insane. With Burgundy's active aid they had done nothing more, during the last five years, than fight out a losing game, in which the circle of lands in their "obedience" was ever slowly decreasing. Their great leader Bedford was broken in mind and body; he was already on his death-bed when the French ultimatum had been

rejected. Their armies were small and disheartened, their French subjects, abandoning their former apathy, were rising in revolt on every side. The English council and parliament could not, or would not, send sufficient supplies of men or money to sustain the war. It was certain that the French with Burgundy's aid would maintain the upper hand which they had already won. But in sullen obstinacy the council refused to be moved, and on the foolish point of honour concerning the use of the style and title of King of France broke off negotiations. Nor was it the council alone which was to blame; it is certain that the people was at one with its rulers; national pride had been roused, and not a voice was heard protesting in favour of peace. John of Bedford did not survive to witness even the first consequences of this momentous decision. He died at Rouen early on the morning of September 15, aged only forty-eight years, yet an old man before his time. He must have known that all his hard work of the last thirteen years had been wasted, and perhaps rejoiced that he was taken away before he could witness its undoing. "He was worthily interred in Notre Dame Church at Rouen, at the north side of the high altar; on whose soul God have mercy," concludes the chronicler. He needed that mercy after his dealings with Jeanne the Maid.

CHAP.
XIII

CHAPTER XIV.

THE LOSS OF FRANCE.

CHAP. WITH the failure of the conference of Arras and the passing
XIV. over of Philip of Burgundy to the French side begins the last and most weary act of the interminable Hundred Years War. There were yet fifteen years to pass before the English were expelled from Normandy, and eighteen before they finally lost their hold on Guienne. The long game was played out with obstinate resolution by the one side, and in a very spasmodic and inconsequent fashion by the other, or it could not have been so long protracted. The English had recovered from the panic into which they had been thrown by the exploits of Jeanne Darc, and were once more the solid troops that they had been in the earlier years of the struggle. Though Bedford, their great statesman and strategist, was gone, there remained many capable hard-fighting officers, veterans whose constancy no defeat could shake. Such were the Earls of Warwick and Huntingdon, the Lords Talbot, Willoughby, and Hungerford, and the old captains John Fastolf and Thomas Kyriel. Several men of the younger generation were also beginning to make themselves a good military reputation, notably Richard Duke of York and his brother-in-law and inseparable ally, Richard Neville, Earl of Salisbury.¹ Under such leaders the hopeless struggle was maintained with much greater success than might have been expected. For Charles VII. was still in the hands of ministers of second-rate ability, and his captains—the Bastard of Orleans, La Hire, Pothon de Xaintrailles, and the rest—were mere dashing adventurers with no touch of strategic talent,

¹ Neville succeeded to the title of Salisbury by marrying Alice, daughter and heiress of the last Montagu earl, who fell at the siege of Orleans. York had married his sister, Cecily Neville.

good at a joust or a sudden assault, but incapable of planning a campaign. Moreover, France was in as great financial embarrassment as ever; she was drained dry by the long period of domestic and foreign strife. The mercenaries who formed the core of the armies of Charles VII. could only be relied upon for good service when they were paid, and their pay reached them irregularly or not at all: when it failed they took to harrying the country, or else drifted off to the wars of Italy. The French advance was made by fits and starts, with long intervals of quiescence caused by droughts in the treasury, or court intrigues, or quarrels between the military leaders. Yet it was unending and inevitable: when checked at one point by the obstinate resistance of the English, it was always making progress at another. Its very incoherence and want of central direction made it all the harder to provide against.

CHAP.
XIV.

The English ambassadors returned from Arras to London to report that they had rejected the French terms. The parliament approved their insane determination, and went out of its way to declare war on Burgundy, before he had formally notified his accession to the French cause. Money was granted in somewhat more liberal fashion than had been seen of late—the king was to have not only a tenth and a fifteenth, but a graduated income-tax on all incomes of over £5 a year. Incomes of from 100 shillings to £100 paid sixpence in the pound, those with £100 to £400 eightpence, those with £400 or over no less than two shillings. The council were authorised to raise £100,000 by loan, but no one was to be forced to lend by compulsion. The young Duke of York was to go over to France as successor to Bedford, while Gloucester was made captain of Calais—a position which was likely to be no sinecure for the future, since all the region around it was in the hands of England's new enemy, the Duke of Burgundy.

Before the preparations voted by parliament for the campaign of 1436 could be carried out, a series of disasters occurred. During the winter the French burst into northern Normandy, and seized Dieppe, Fécamp, and Harfleur; the peasantry rose in their aid on all sides. A little later many of the places around Paris were lost—St. Germain, Corbeil, and Pontoise among them. The only success won by the English was that the over-daring party of adventurers which had seized St. Denis

CHAP. XIV. had been compelled to surrender on October 4, 1435. But despite of this last effort, Paris was almost cut off from Normandy, and both the garrison and the burghers were reduced to the edge of famine. In April the armies of the King of France closed in around the capital: the Burgundian marshal, L'Isle Adam, was in joint command with the Constable de Richemont and the Bastard of Orleans. Sir Thomas Beaumont went out with part of the garrison to obstruct their advance, but his force was annihilated at Epinay, and he himself captured. Three days later, when the French appeared before the gates, the Parisian militia refused to man the defences, and L'Isle Adam entered near the Porte-St.-Jacques, by escalading an unguarded section of the wall. Lord Willoughby was forced to shut himself up in the Bastille with his English troops, less than 1,000 strong. Four days later he capitulated, on condition that he should be allowed to retire unmolested to Normandy. The joy of the Parisians at coming once more under the jurisdiction of their natural king, and receiving an amnesty for their long adherence to Henry VI., was soon tempered by the fact that the condition of the city was found to be little improved by the change of masters. The English garrisons of Creil, Meaux, Montereau, and Montargis kept the Isle de France so well harried that the famine was not even yet removed, and entry or exit was still unsafe. Charles VII. did not dare to visit Paris till November, 1437, nineteen months after it had hoisted his banner. It was some years before the half-depopulated city began to recover its old importance.

Meanwhile Philip of Burgundy, anxious to celebrate his entry into the French ranks by a great exploit, had laid siege to Calais on August 9, 1436, at the head of a great levy of his vassals from Flanders and Artois: rumour placed their numbers at more than 30,000 men. But the spirit of the English was burning high this year, and they were more incensed against their former ally than against their old enemies. Within a month an army of 8,000 men had been collected, with which Gloucester crossed the Straits, intending to fight at all costs; he sent a formal challenge to Burgundy to meet him and swore to punish his treachery. But the relieving force came too late; Burgundy had already raised the siege. His Flemish levies were melting away long before he gave them leave to depart.

Abandoning part of his siege train and a great store of provisions, he returned ignominiously to Gravelines on July 31. Gloucester, landing two days later, found no foe to fight, and ravaged west Flanders as far as Poperinghe, Bailleul, and St. Omer, after which he sailed home—his force not having been equipped for a serious campaign, but only for the single end of relieving Calais. The English arms were no less fortunate in Normandy; the Duke of York had landed near Honfleur in June, and set himself to the recovery of the revolted districts of the Pays de Caux, where he reduced Fécamp and Lillebonne, and slaughtered many bands of the insurgent peasantry. The enemy made no attempt to send aid to them, being distracted between the siege of Creil and two raids into central and western Normandy, all of which failed miserably. But the great success of York's lieutenancy was the storm of Pontoise, the key of the Seine valley, and the most important of the outer bulwarks of Paris. It was taken by escalade on the night of February 12, 1437, when its strong water-defences were rendered useless by a hard frost. Ivry and some places in the Vexin were also recovered during the winter. Altogether the English cause in France prospered far better than might have been expected under the new governor.

Meanwhile the French had prepared a powerful diversion in the north. James I. of Scotland, who had kept the truce so well during the earlier years of his reign, had been persuaded to fall back into the traditional policy of his predecessors and to league himself with France. Already, some time before, he had promised the hand of his eldest daughter Margaret to the dauphin Louis, but this had not involved an actual breach with England. In 1436, however, he refused to renew the truce, which ran out that summer, and marched with a great host to besiege Roxburgh, just at the moment when Humphrey of Gloucester had sailed for Calais with his hastily assembled army of relief. James had vainly hoped that England was stripped of fighting men; but he was soon undeceived. The Percies and Nevilles turned out against him at the head of all the levies of the north, and he was forced to raise the leaguer of Roxburgh and to retreat in haste on August 15. In the following February he was murdered at Perth by domestic conspirators. With his death the short war between Scotland and

CHAP. England came to an end, for the queen-regent Joan Beaufort,
XIV. and her ministers Creighton and Livingstone, promptly made peace in the name of the young King James II.

In the year 1437 Charles VII., leaving Normandy almost unmolested, applied himself to the useful but unenterprising policy of reducing the outlying English fortresses in the Isle de France. He captured Beauvoir, Nemours, and the more important stronghold of Montereau. Meanwhile Philip of Burgundy, much distracted by a revolt of the towns of Flanders, had done no more than send his Picard levies to besiege Crotoy at the Somme mouth, now the northernmost of all the places held by the English. The siege was raised by Lord Talbot, who drove off the Burgundians with ease. But before this success was won a new lieutenant of the king had superseded York at Rouen; on July 16 the old Earl of Warwick was appointed to the post. Why the change was made it is hard to see: the duke had been a successful administrator, and the earl protested that he was loth to buckle on his armour once more at the age of sixty. Certain of the later chroniclers connect the change with the strife between Gloucester and the Beauforts, and state that York was removed as a partisan of Duke Humphrey. But there is little contemporary evidence to bear out the statement,¹ while York apparently suggested his own recall. English domestic politics at this time are most obscure, and it is almost impossible to construct from jejune annalists, and from state documents which deliberately conceal the causes of things, any satisfactory picture of the course of events. Apparently the place of Cardinal Beaufort, who was now growing old, was beginning to be taken by his nephews, John Earl of Somerset, who returned to England this year after having been a captive in France ever since the day of Baugé, and Edmund Count of Mortagne. They were allied with William de la Pole Earl of Suffolk and Kemp Archbishop of York. Gloucester, who since Bedford's death was first prince of the blood and heir to the throne, would appear to have been backed by the Earl of Huntingdon, Richard Duke of York, and the Earl of Salisbury.² A little later the two

¹ Only the *London Chronicle* (ed. Kingsford), p. 143, represents the duke as discontented. For the other view see Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii., 133.

² The division of parties may be deduced from Gloucester's "protest" to the king of June 2, 1440, printed in J. Stevenson's *Wars in France*, ii., 440.

factions begin to be distinguished as the peace party and the war party, the Beauforts bowing to the necessity of coming to terms with France, while Gloucester and his friends preached the duty of maintaining the struggle to the end. But this divergence was not yet developed: the cardinal himself at Arras had broken off the negotiations rather than sign away his great-nephew's vain title of King of France.

In 1437 died both the queens-dowager of England—Joan of Navarre, the widow of Henry IV., and Katharine of Valois, the mother of the reigning king. Katharine seems never to have had much influence at her son's court. She practically retired into private life, having wedded in secret Owen Tudor, a Welsh gentleman of good lineage but small estate. By him she had a daughter and three sons, of whom two, Edmund and Jasper Tudor, were destined to play some part in the politics of the next generation. In such obscurity did the queen-mother dwell that it was only after she had borne her second husband several children that the council became alive to the situation, and punished the aspiring Welshman by a term of imprisonment.¹

The progress of the war abroad in 1438-41 shows little of importance. The French succeeded in making an end of the English garrisons in the Isle-de-France, by capturing Meaux in September, 1439, Creil in May, 1440, and Pontoise in September, 1441. The last-named place made a long and desperate defence, and was thrice relieved by Lord Talbot and once by Richard of York ere it finally succumbed. The duke had returned once more to Normandy, as the king's lieutenant in France, after the death of Warwick in 1439, and showed his usual capacity and perseverance in fighting out the losing game committed to his charge. But the greatest success of the English arms during this period of depression fell not to him but to his future rival, Edmund Beaufort, who in July, 1440, retook Harfleur, which had been lost as far back as 1435, and had ever since remained as a thorn in the back of the English governors of Normandy. The place was only recovered after a long leaguer, and a sharp fight, in which a relieving army led by the Bastard of Orleans and La Hire had been beaten off.

¹ Some doubted, but wrongly, whether there had been a marriage at all.

CHAP. All the French efforts in this region had not enabled them to
XIV. make a solid lodgment in the duchy—the only places left in their hands were Dieppe, Granville, and Louviers, which were still surrounded on all sides by English territory.

Meanwhile the armies of Charles VII. had begun to make incursions in the duchy of Guienne, a quarter where they had never before been seen. While the struggle along the Loire and the Seine was still doubtful, the French king had no troops to spare for an assault on this outlying region, where the English domination rested not on the spears and bows of an alien garrison but on the willing obedience of the whole population. Apparently Charles had feared to provoke an attack on his rear, by stirring up strife in the Bordelais, during the earlier years of the war. The English government, on the other hand, had been contented to let matters stand still on the Gironde, while it needed every man that it could raise for the campaigns of Normandy and the Isle de France. Guienne had taken care of itself—and no more was asked of it. The only change of frontier in this quarter since the treaty of Troyes had been a slight advance of the English in the years 1420-25, when La Réole, Bazas, St. Macaire, and other places had been captured by the local levies of the duchy. Now at last, in 1438, the French felt themselves so strong in the north that they could, without risking anything, detach a force to operate on the Gironde. Several columns, starting from distant bases, made incursions into the English territory: it was intended that they should meet in front of Bordeaux; but most of the captains allowed themselves to be diverted into siege operations against frontier castles, or turned aside for mere plunder. The only permanent conquest made by the French was the little town of Tartas. Indeed the main advantage which they gained from the campaign was that for the future the attention of the English council was partly distracted from Normandy: in 1439 the Earl of Huntingdon was sent out to Guienne with over 2,000 men, a force which was sadly needed at Rouen. The earl swept back the invaders, and once more made safe the frontiers of the Bordelais.

In 1439 there appeared some remote possibility that a peace, or at any rate a truce, might be concluded between England and France. Beaufort and his party had come to

the conclusion that they had been unwise in breaking off the conference at Arras four years back, and were ready to concede much that they had refused to grant in 1435. But the French terms had risen since then; it was to no purpose that a conference was held between Calais and Gravelines, at which the English ambassadors finally offered to recognise Charles as King of France, and to surrender all that they held outside Normandy, Maine, Guienne, and Calais, on condition that Henry should, like his uncle, be permitted to use the style and arms of King of France. The enemy refused to come to terms, exacting the resignation of the royal title and the cession of Maine, and so the envoys parted. The Duke of Gloucester is credited with having secured the rejection of the French offers, by making desperate and successful appeals to the pride and patriotism of the council, while the cardinal was absent at the conference. One advantage was secured by these negotiations—Philip of Burgundy made a private truce with England for his northern dominions; it was to last for three years; this relieved the pressure on Calais, and enabled the council to turn more attention to the defence of Normandy. A similar truce with Brittany, concluded in the next year, was also a clear gain for England. Of more doubtful expediency was the release of the Duke of Orleans in the end of 1440. For twenty-five years he had lain in the Tower and other English castles, solacing his weary hours with poetry, and making constant but ineffective endeavours to prove to the English government that his release would be to their political advantage. Now, a man well advanced in middle age, he obtained his wish, not so much through the ransom of 50,000 marks which he undertook to pay, as by promising to use his endeavours towards the conclusion of a peace. It is almost certain that he also promised to bring pressure on King Charles by joining the other princes of the blood, in a conspiracy against the royal authority. In the summer of this year the Dukes of Bourbon and Alençon and the Count of Vendôme, with the guilty knowledge of the dauphin Louis, had raised the so-called *Praguerie* against the king. They failed for the moment, but were ready to renew the revolt. Orleans, as it would seem, was eager to join them, and the English government released him in the hope that it was securing an outbreak of civil war in France, the one thing

CHAP. that could paralyse the advance of Charles VII. against Nor-
XIV. mandy and Guienne.

This device was not wholly fruitless. Orleans busied himself during the year 1442 in knitting up once more the league of the princes. But they went no further than threats and intrigues: they worried and distracted Charles VII., but they did not take up arms against him. Nothing short of actual civil war in France could relieve the pressure on Normandy and Bordeaux, and no civil war broke out. Indeed in the summer of 1442 the king himself led a royal army into Guienne, and captured St. Sever, Dax, La Réole and many other places. Some of them were recovered by the English in the following winter, but nevertheless a dangerous breach had been made in the defences of Guienne, and while such reinforcements as could be raised were being shipped to Bordeaux, the Duke of York was left unsupported in Normandy. It was to no effect that York sent Lord Talbot in the autumn to lay siege to Dieppe, the chief foothold of the French in the duchy. Talbot, too weak to circumvallate the whole *enceinte* of the fortress, lay before its walls in a fortified camp for no less than nine months. But Dieppe was repeatedly revictualled, and the besiegers were finally driven off by an army commanded by the dauphin in August, 1443.

Long before the French invasion of Guienne or the siege of Dieppe had begun, English domestic politics had been taking a new turn, and Humphrey of Gloucester had been humbled to the dust by the Beauforts. Early in 1441 his duchess—that Eleanor Cobham for whom he had deserted Jacqueline of Hainault—had been arrested on a charge of sorcery. She was accused of having practised unholy rites in company with an astrologer named Roger Bolingbroke and one Margery Jourdain, commonly known as the Witch of Eye.¹ They had not only presumed to inquire of the stars concerning the destiny of the young king, but had practised against his life in the regular necromantic style by melting a waxen image made in his likeness over a slow fire. It is probable that the duchess was guilty; she was an unscrupulous and ambitious woman, and could not help reflecting on the change that would be made in her

¹ Or, the Witch by Westminster, according to Gregory, p. 184.

husband's fortunes if the delicate and feeble Henry VI. were to expire. If Humphrey became king there would be an end of the ascendancy of the Beauforts. It is notable that the duke himself was not included in the charge; there can have been no evidence against him, or his enemies would have endeavoured to make away with him. The duchess was tried before Cardinals Beaufort and Kemp, and the commissaries of Archbishop Chichele, who pleaded ill-health and kept out of the business so far as he was able. She admitted dealings with Bolingbroke and the witch, but denied having practised against the king's health or life. The court condemned her and her accomplices: the astrologer was hanged, drawn, and quartered; the witch burnt at Smithfield; the duchess's life was spared, but she was made to walk barefoot on three days through the streets of London, robed in a sheet and bearing a candle of a pound's weight. She was then banished for life to solitary confinement, first in Chester Castle, then in the Isle of Man, finally in Wales: she survived for some ten years. Duke Humphrey made no attempt to defend his wife, either because he was aware of her guilt, or because he feared to be involved in her punishment himself if he should stir; in the whole business he presents a sorry spectacle. Nevertheless her guilt was visited on him; he lost what power and influence he had hitherto retained; for the next six years the Beauforts were predominant in the council, and he could do nought save collect books, correspond with literary men, and make petulant protests from time to time against the government.

The triumph of the cardinal was marked by the promotion of his elder nephew John Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, to the chief command in Guienne, where it had been resolved that a great effort should be made in 1443, and by the creation of a new marquisate of Dorset for Edmund the younger brother. Unfortunately neither John nor Edmund was a man of ability. Somerset was allowed to divert from Normandy all the reinforcements which had been promised to the Duke of York. By great exertion an army of nearly 5,000 men was collected for him—the largest force that had been raised for many years. He sailed in August, 1443, but instead of making straight for Bordeaux, where his presence was sorely needed, landed in the Côtentin, and prosecuted a useless raid into Maine and Anjou,

CHAP: where he took one or two small places, but failed to affect the
XIV. general fortune of the war. After losing many men and spending much money, he turned back, completely foiled, into Normandy. Next spring he came home invalided and died; his title¹ fell to his brother Edmund, but his estates passed to his only child, that Lady Margaret who was to be the ancestress of all the Tudors. His place as chief confidant of the old cardinal was taken by his brother, who was to prove the evil genius of the house of Lancaster. The only personage who could vie in importance with Edmund Beaufort was his steadfast ally William de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, who was to share in all his misfortunes.

The failure of Somerset's costly expedition drove the council into reopening negotiations with King Charles; they offered at last that their master Henry VI. should resign his French title, and be content to retain Normandy, Maine, and Guienne. It was suggested that a permanent peace might well be secured by the marriage of the young sovereign of England to a French princess. The lady for whose hand he sued was Margaret, daughter of René of Anjou, titular king of Naples, Sicily, and Jerusalem, and niece by marriage of Charles VII. Her name had been suggested by the Duke of Orleans, who showed himself ready to help forward the negotiations. Early in 1444 the Earl of Suffolk and Moleyns, Bishop of Chichester, sailed for France, with full powers to conclude a treaty which should sign away King Henry's claim to the French crown. But the adversary, seeing England eager for peace, was by no means anxious to accept her terms. Charles refused to grant Normandy and Guienne in full suzerainty to the King of England.² Henry might keep them, but only on condition that he rendered for them the homage that his ancestors had been wont to pay. Normandy, however, he wished to recover, if the English ambassadors proved sufficiently pliant. Maine he did not intend to resign; it was true that the English were in possession of Le Mans, Beaumont, and several other fortresses in the county; but the French were solidly established at Laval, and Charles intended to maintain his grasp upon Maine and

¹ The earldom, not the duchy, of Somerset. But the duchy was recreated for Edmund in 1448.

² See for the French claims J. Stevenson's *English in France*, i., 131-33 and 151.

if necessary to compensate his nephew by some concessions in Guienne. Suffolk conducted the negotiation indiscreetly; he showed such anxiety to secure peace that the French were encouraged to raise their demands at every interview. At last he committed his master to the marriage with Margaret of Anjou, in return for nothing more than a truce for two years. The betrothal took place on May 24, 1444, the truce was signed on the 28th. The princess was to receive no dowry save her father's illusory claims to the kingdoms of Aragon and Majorca, of which Alfonso the Magnanimous was in undisputed possession. Suffolk then returned to London to report the conclusion of the truce, and to hold up an utterly unjustifiable hope of turning it into a permanent peace by subsequent negotiations. He was rewarded for his services by being created a marquis.

But he was soon destined to be undeceived; on his return to France he found the ministers of Charles VII. set upon inducing the English government to surrender Normandy and Maine in return for a grant of territory on the side of Guienne; Périgord and Quercy were offered—a compensation quite inadequate. Concealing his fears that no reasonable terms of peace would be obtainable, Suffolk determined that the marriage and the truce at least should be carried through; if the whole negotiation failed, he would become a laughing-stock in England, because of the sanguine reports which he had laid before the king and the council. The marriage was celebrated by proxy at Nancy in February, 1445, though it had to be bought by a secret promise that all the strongholds of Maine should be surrendered. This concession Suffolk concealed from the nation, perhaps even from the council. He put off the evil day of its disclosure, which was sure to arouse angry protests in England, by engaging that a French embassy should come to London in the summer to treat for definitive terms of peace. Meanwhile he escorted Queen Margaret to meet her husband. She crossed the Channel on April 9, 1445, and was wedded to the king at Titchfield Abbey a fortnight later.

Seldom had a more ill-matched pair met. Margaret, then aged sixteen, was in the flower of her youthful beauty, full of spirit, pride, ambition and intelligence. She had the will to rule, and from what she knew of her husband she thought that she would have the power to rule also. Henry was a pious and

CHAP.
XIV.

well-intentioned nonentity. He was now twenty-three years of age, but there has been no occasion to mention any of his acts since he was crowned at Paris fifteen years before. Though he had reached an age at which his father and his grandfather had been wont to lead armies and dictate treaties, he remained a contented puppet in the hands of his ministers. For the present the Beauforts and Suffolk were his masters; his uncle Gloucester he had been taught to detest as an evil liver and a bad Christian. From the laudatory biography written by his chaplain Blackman, our best authority for his personality, we can only gather that he ought to have been a monk or a schoolmaster.¹ The anecdotes recorded by the admiring Carthusian are often ludicrous. Henry ran out in horror from a state ball at which certain ladies wore dresses cut too low at the neck, crying "Fy fy, for shame! forsooth ye be to blame". He was so shocked at the scanty proportions of the bathing costumes used at the watering-place of Bath that he hastily left the town. He had so much care for the morals of his household that he caused little secret windows to be made to his chamber, from which he could command the palace gate, and satisfy himself that improper persons were excluded. He was never heard to swear, though, if much distressed and excited, he was known to exclaim "Forsooth and forsooth!" He would wear no colour but black, brown, and russet in his ordinary dress, and bore a dislike to his state robes because of their garish blue and crimson. On one occasion he gave them all away to a begging abbot, to the discomfiture of his chamberlain. He was very kindly, very liberal, and very weak in his memory; he seldom refused anything for which he was asked, and caused strange confusions by nominating two persons to the same office, or writing commendatory letters for each of two rivals. He was generally in straits for money from his inordinate love of giving; and when his debts were at their worst would still borrow, on exorbitant terms, sums to aid in endowing his two great foundations of Eton and King's College, Cambridge. We are told that his happiest moments were when he walked round Windsor, meeting Eton boys, to whom he would give groats, with the excellent advice that they should

¹This tract is printed at the end of Hearne's edition of Otterbourne's *Chronicles*, Oxford, 1732.

serve God, attend to their lessons, and avoid the court, where there were many bad men, who might set them an evil example and corrupt their good manners. Naturally he disliked war, and never visited France in the days of his manhood, though his ancestors had been known to take the field at fifteen. Indeed he only twice assumed armour, even during the civil wars, and when led into the battle would stand stock still under his banner, refusing to use his weapons upon Christian men. An amiable but most unfortunate trait in his character was that he was so affectionate and trusting that he could never believe any ill of his ministers and personal friends, and could not be induced to dismiss them even when they had given ample proof of incapacity or bad faith. If he had consented to rid himself of Suffolk and Somerset without a struggle, there might have been no Wars of the Roses.

From the first Henry was completely dominated by his clever, lively, and strong-willed young wife. If the queen had chanced to quarrel with the ministers there would have been trouble at court; but Margaret seems to have been sincerely attached to Suffolk and the Beauforts; they were firm allies, from the first moment of her landing, and agreed in looking upon Humphrey of Gloucester as their chosen enemy. He was still the heir to the throne if King Henry should die without issue; and as years went by without the appearance of a child from the royal wedlock, his succession began to seem by no means improbable. There is no doubt that the queen hated him, not only as the foe of the Beauforts and Suffolk, but as the possible successor of her husband.

Suffolk's promises of a successful treaty with France were soon proved futile. In the summer of 1445 an embassy, headed by the Archbishop of Reims, appeared in London; but though the peace-loving king did his best to arrive at an agreement, nothing could be done. The French claimed Maine, which Suffolk had sacrificed to them, and wanted Normandy also. They offered not only Quercy and Périgord but Saintonge and the Limousin in return for the duchy. This offer was refused, and the ambassadors departed. In the December following Henry VI. confirmed Suffolk's promise that Maine should be surrendered, in return for a further prolongation of the truce till April 1, 1447—an absurdly small gain to buy at

CHAP. XIV. such a price; but the king had been persuaded that he must redeem his minister's pledge. It was probably because the rumour of this surrender was getting abroad—or at least because Suffolk and his friends feared that it must soon get abroad—that a sudden blow against their old enemy Gloucester was carried out at the end of the winter. If the duke obtained such a good excuse for making one of his wonted outbursts against a dishonourable peace, he would on this occasion find general support among the magnates and the people.

Accordingly a parliament was called at Bury St. Edmunds on February 10, 1447, and when Gloucester, apparently suspecting nothing, appeared with a small retinue of eighty horse, he was met by Lord Beaumont, the Constable of England, Edmund Beaufort, and the Duke of Buckingham, who arrested him on a charge of treason. All his servants and retainers were sent away, and many of them imprisoned; he was placed in close confinement under charge of two of the king's household named Pulford and Hawley. Five days later, on February 23, it was announced that he had died of a paralytic stroke, brought on by rage and grief. It is probable that he had suffered the fate which befel the last holder of the title of Gloucester at Calais in 1397, and had been poisoned or smothered. The evidence is incomplete, but the circumstances are too suspicious to permit us to acquit Suffolk and his friends of a crime. When once the step of arresting the duke had been taken, it would have been impossible to let him go forth alive.¹ It is conceivable that Humphrey was carried off by a paralytic stroke—but if so the hand of nature only anticipated by a few days the hand of the destined assassin. After his death the details of his alleged treason were published; he had conspired to release his wife from prison, to kidnap the king, and to seize the throne. Five of his chief followers, one of them his natural

¹ Though the best contemporary chronicles accept, with some doubt, the story that Gloucester died a natural death, the presumptive evidence against it is strong. The conspirators could never have ventured to try Gloucester publicly, and they had gone so far that only his death could prevent a trial. They removed all his servants from about him (*London Chronicles*, ed. Kingsford, p. 157); Sir James Ramsay when he alleges that two chaplains and some others were left with him (*Lancaster and York*, ii., 76), is quoting merely a list of persons who attended his funeral (see *Engl. Chron.*, ed. Davis, p. 118), a very different matter.

son Arthur, were formally arraigned for having taken part in the plot, condemned, and brought to the scaffold, but pardoned when the rope was already round their necks. His estates were all confiscated and divided among Suffolk's friends, the queen receiving part of the plunder. Possibly she may also have had her share in the guilt of Gloucester's murder—she was only eighteen, but already she was a bitter partisan, and a good hater. The king may be absolved from any participation in the matter; Cardinal Beaufort must also be acquitted, for it was now more than three years since he had ceased to follow the court and attend the council. He had retired to his bishopric of Winchester, handing over the headship of the party that he had so long led to his nephew Edmund Beaufort and his friend Suffolk. He died in his castle of Wolvesey, under the shadow of his cathedral, only six weeks after Gloucester's murder. On Suffolk and on Edmund of Somerset must fall the responsibility for the doings at Bury.

The removal of the duke was, in reality, a very unwise and short-sighted step: the unscrupulous politicians who devised it had destroyed an enemy who had long been discredited, and who throughout his career had shown himself incapable of managing a party or conducting a policy with common capacity. His place as first prince of the blood was taken by his cousin, Richard of York, a man of a very different character and a far more formidable foe. As general and administrator he had achieved a high reputation, by maintaining the duchy of Normandy almost intact against all the assaults of the French, even when the reinforcements that should have come to his aid had been distracted to the army of Somerset or the defence of Guienne. He was cautious, reticent, and resolute; moreover, unlike Duke Humphrey, he was the father of an enormous family: seven children had already been born to him, and there were five more yet to come.

About the time of the parliament of Bury, Suffolk succeeded in getting the truce with France renewed till January 1, 1448. But the French government was now beginning to press for the cession of Maine, according to the agreement which the king had signed in December, 1445. In face of their demands the conduct of Suffolk and his ally, the Earl of Somerset, who was sent as the king's lieutenant to Normandy

CHAP.
XIV.

in the spring of 1448, was as futile as it was dishonourable. They avoided summoning a parliament in 1448, so that they escaped for the moment from the unpleasant duty of avowing what they had done. Meanwhile they put off the surrender of Maine by paltry devices; they sent dilatory embassies to France, claiming that they must have time to pay off the garrisons. At last when in September, 1447, formal orders were sent to Osbern Mundeford, captain of Le Mans, to surrender his stronghold, he refused, on the pretext that the document was not countersigned by Somerset, his immediate superior as governor of Normandy. There is reason to believe that Beaufort himself was a consenting party to this mean stratagem. Not unreasonably provoked by these shufflings, the King of France sent an army into Maine, and threatened to recommence the war. This at last brought the English government to reason, and when the French host actually laid siege to Le Mans in the spring of 1448, that place, Mayenne, Beaumont, and other strongholds were at last surrendered. It was more than two years since Henry VI. had signed the agreement that they should be given up, and Suffolk would apparently have haggled on for ever, if force had not been applied.

There was, as might have been expected, an outburst of indignation in England when the long-concealed contract to surrender Maine was at last carried out. Suffolk, as if unconscious of his unpopularity, gave to his friend Somerset his deceased brother's ducal title in March, and created himself a duke also in June. He seems to have considered that his position was safe because he had got rid of York, the natural leader of any opposition that might be raised against him. Duke Richard had been appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland for ten years in July, 1447; and though he regarded the office as nothing but an honourable exile, he had crossed to Dublin and taken up his duties there.

Though the surrender of Maine had prevented the outbreak of war between England and France in 1448, and though Charles VII. had renewed the truce for two years more after his diplomatic triumph, the war began once again in 1449. The cause of the rupture was the indiscipline of the English troops in Normandy, and the bad faith of Suffolk and Somerset. The garrisons withdrawn from Le Mans and the other

ceded places had been established on the frontiers of Brittany, at Mortain and St. James de Beuvron. They were discontented, and had not received their arrears of pay for service in their old quarters in Maine. On March 24 they took arms under Francisco de Surienne, an Aragonese adventurer who had long held command under successive governors of Normandy.¹ They crossed the Breton frontier and seized the rich town of Fougères, where it is said that they obtained 2,000,000 *livres tournois* of plunder and ransom. When summoned to punish these brigands, and to make reparation for their outrage, Somerset professed that he was unable to control his troops; Suffolk sent shuffling apologies, but said no word of reparation. The Bretons attacked Normandy at once; Charles VII., however, gave the English time for repentance by offering to hold off if Fougères were restored and compensation made for its plunder. This moderate request being denied he declared war in July, 1449.

Normandy had been so well defended by Bedford, York, and Talbot in the earlier years of the struggle, that it seems that Somerset and Suffolk had never conceived it possible that the whole duchy might be overrun and subdued in a single campaign, if the invaders were well led and the defence was in weak and incapable hands. While levies were being raised in England in a leisurely fashion, and supplies were being granted by a parliament which sat at Winchester from June 16 to July 16, the French king collected four armies, which entered Normandy from separate directions when the negotiations were at an end. The attack was made in overwhelming strength, and Somerset did not think himself strong enough to face even one of the invading columns in pitched battle. He shut himself up in Rouen, and appealed to all his lieutenants to hold out manfully till reinforcements should arrive from home. Meanwhile French forces swept over the whole duchy; in the west the Dukes of Brittany and Alençon captured in quick

¹ The Aragonese tried to prove afterwards that he had obtained the open or tacit consent both of Suffolk and of Somerset to his raid. See the documents in J. Stevenson's *English in France*, i., 259-60. This seems almost incredible (see Ramsay, ii., 92; Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii., 152). The adventurer had certainly visited London and seen Suffolk; Somerset seems also to have hinted that Surienne had been encouraged in England (Basin, p. 338).

CHAP.
XIV.

succession Argentan, Alençon, Coutances, Saint Lô, and Valognes. In the centre a column under Dunois, the Bastard of Orleans, took Evreux, Lisieux, Pont de l'Arche, and Mantes. A Burgundian force raised in Picardy beset the northern side of the duchy, and took Fécamp, Gisors, and Neuchâtel. When King Charles himself came up at the head of the fourth or reserve division, he felt himself so strong and found that the way had been so well prepared for him, that he determined to march straight on Rouen. The complete collapse of the English defence is easily to be explained; in the five years of truce since 1444 the garrison of Normandy had been allowed, for economy's sake, to sink below the level of safety. The government had not succeeded in bringing it up to its old strength while the negotiations were in progress, though the Earl of Shrewsbury had brought over some small reinforcements. But even if the armed force in the duchy had been larger, it would have failed to hold its own, for the Normans had now frankly espoused the cause of the invaders. Not only did the burghers refuse to man their walls at the call of their governors, but they very frequently took arms to fall upon the English garrison in the rear. During the last struggle in 1440-44 they had remained inert, still cowed by the memory of the repression of the rising of 1436, and mistrustful of the final success of Charles VII. There was now no doubt which was the winning side; at Verneuil, Lisieux, Mantes, and many places more, the inhabitants threw open the gates.

Of this tendency Rouen was to set the most conspicuous example. A first attempt of the French to storm the city failed on October 16, but three days later the townsfolk rose, and, while fierce street fighting was going on, opened a gate to the besiegers. Somerset was forced into the citadel, and ten days later capitulated: he was allowed to retire to Caen, on condition that he should evacuate Tancarville, Caudebec, and other garrisons on the lower Seine, and hand over the Earl of Shrewsbury and other hostages as a pledge for the execution of his promise. The King of France entered Rouen in triumph on November 10, and finished his campaign by capturing Château-Gaillard and Harfleur before the year was out. Thus two-thirds of the Norman duchy had been conquered in less than six months. There remained under Somerset's control

only the central region about Caen, Bayeux, Vire, Domfront, and Falaise, with Avranches and the outlying Cherbourg, at the point of the Côtentin. CHAP. XIV.

The wrath aroused in England by the rapidity of the French conquests led to a general attack on Suffolk. Before dealing with his fall it will be more convenient to conduct the Norman campaign to its end. His last act as minister was to order the gathering at Portsmouth of an army destined to reinforce Somerset. No great peer would undertake to serve under the unlucky government, and the troops were entrusted to Sir Thomas Kyriel, one of Bedford's veteran captains. Money and equipment were lacking, and the men were detained at Portsmouth waiting for them. They gave a startling proof of their ill-temper by murdering on January 9 Moleyns, Bishop of Chichester, who had long held the privy seal, and was one of Suffolk's most trusted subordinates. Though he came down with a long-expected instalment of cash for the settlement of arrears of pay, the soldiery fell upon him and beat him to death. The winds were foul all through February, and it was only in March that Kyriel and his unruly host got to sea and reached Cherbourg. They were only 2,500 strong, a force hopelessly small for the deliverance of Normandy. Somerset sent out to meet them 1,000 men from the garrisons of Caen and Bayeux, under Sir Matthew Gough, but failed to take the field himself. Kyriel, who should have marched straight to Caen, lingered for a fortnight in the Côtentin besieging Valognes. He took it on April 10, and then resumed his advance; but he had delayed long enough to allow the French captains in Normandy to concentrate. On the 15th he reached Formigny, on the road from Carentan to Bayeux, where he was attacked by a force under the Count of Clermont. He was waging a not unsuccessful fight when 3,000 men under the Constable de Richemont appeared unexpectedly upon his flank. Overwhelmed by numbers the English host tried to retreat: Gough got off with the cavalry, but the bills and bows were surrounded and cut down almost to a man. So little quarter was given that Kyriel was almost the only prisoner.

The disaster of Formigny sealed the fate of Somerset: his remaining garrisons felt that resistance was useless when the long

CHAP.
XIV.

expected army of succour had been annihilated. Avranches and Bayeux yielded in May; the French under Clermont, Richemont, and Dunois then closed in on Caen, where the duke had gathered the relics of his force. He made a rather feeble defence for three weeks, and surrendered on June 24, 1450, to the King of France himself, who had come up to aid his captains in the siege. Terrified by the news of the death of his friend Suffolk, Somerset did not at first dare to return to England, but betook himself to Calais. The remaining English strongholds—Domfront, Falaise, and Cherbourg, all yielded before August was out. Thus the duchy of Normandy which had taken Henry V. four years to conquer, was recovered by Charles VII. in eleven months. Somerset had an impossible task to discharge when he was required to defend it against treachery within and superior force without, but he seems to have made the enemy's work easy by his complete incompetence. Henry VI. was always unfortunate in the choice of his friends.

CHAPTER XV.

THE OUTBREAK OF THE WARS OF THE ROSES.

NORMANDY was overrun by the armies of Charles VII. in such a rapid and masterful fashion, that the English nation could find no explanation for the sudden disaster but treason on the part of the king's advisers. A riotous outburst of popular indignation against the incapable and shuffling Suffolk, who was responsible for the king's policy, and the dilatory Somerset, who was losing the Norman towns at the rate of two or three a week, was inevitable. Even a firm and capable king would have felt his throne rocking beneath him, and have prepared to disavow his ministers, and promise a strict inquiry into their conduct. But Henry VI. failed to comprehend the situation; for Suffolk and Somerset he had nothing but confidence and affection. Attacks on them seemed to him cruel and inequitable, even incomprehensible. In his feeble way he set himself to resist the national will.

CHAP.
XV.

Fourteen days after the murder of Bishop Moleyns at Portsmouth, the first open sign of revolution, parliament re-assembled at Westminster. On the third day of its session, January 26, the Commons petitioned for Suffolk's trial and impeachment. The charges brought against him, as was so often the case in medieval English politics, were to a large extent absurd. He was accused of corruptly mismanaging the siege of Orleans twenty years back, in the days of Jeanne the Maid; of having plotted to marry his son to the Lady Margaret Beaufort, with the intention of claiming for her the succession to the throne; of having held private intrigues with the French king; of having hindered the raising of troops for Normandy, and of having dissipated corruptly £60,000 of public

CHAP. money. All this was malignant nonsense, as absurd as the
 XV. charges brought against his grandfather Michael de la Pole in 1387. But the articles of accusation reached firmer ground when they accused him of having bartered away without any necessity the province of Maine, in order to buy the king's marriage with Margaret of Anjou, of having given crown property to his friends, of interfering with the due execution of justice in the realm, and of estranging the king from his relatives, that is, the Duke of York. It is odd that he was not charged with the murder of Humphrey of Gloucester, on which a good *prima facie* case could have been made out against him.

Speaker Tresham, who was an ally of the Duke of York, urged all these charges, good, bad and indifferent, with great zeal. But when Suffolk should have been sent to be tried before his peers, he did not claim his right, but threw himself upon the king's mercy, evidently by a prearranged agreement with his master. On March 17 Henry called a meeting of all the peers in London, and informed them that he had taken the duke's case into his own hands. Suffolk should not be tried, but should be banished the realm for five years from May 1 following. This sentence satisfied no one; riots broke out in London and Kent, and Suffolk had to escape in disguise from the capital. He sailed from Ipswich on April 30, making for the continent, but off the Kentish coast his ship was intercepted by half a dozen vessels which were lying in wait for him. He was seized and beheaded across the gunwale of a boat, without any proper form of trial, on May 2; his head and body were then rowed ashore and placed on the sands by Dover. It is an inexplicable fact that there was a king's ship, the *Nicholas of the Tower*, among the intercepting squadron, though we know well enough that the unfortunate king was Suffolk's one true friend. Evidently he was unable to prevent his own captains from joining in the hunt after his favourite. Possibly some member of the council with a grudge against Suffolk may have been in the business; Lord Cromwell had been suggested, because he had just before accused the duke of trying to get him assassinated. Others see in the matter a deliberate act of the Yorkist party; if so York himself, still far away in Ireland, can have had nothing to do with it. The king and queen were heartbroken, but the popular ballads of the day show

brutal rejoicing over the end of "the traitor who sold away
Maine".¹

CHAP.
XV.

The death of Suffolk was only the beginning of troubles; his friends were still in office, if he himself was gone, and Somerset's last mismanaged struggle in Normandy was stirring every one to wrath. It was certainly the news of Formigny that roused the wild outbreak known as "Jack Cade's rebellion," which began on May 31 and did not reach its end till July 12. From the place of its origin and the general aspect of its events this rising has often been compared with Tyler's great insurrection. But they were essentially different in character. Tyler's rebellion had causes that were mainly social in character, Cade's was almost entirely political in its origin. In 1381 Tyler and Ball wanted to sweep away the whole existing framework of rural society. In 1450 the manifestoes of the rebels declaim against the traitors who have lost France, perverted the course of justice, murdered Humphrey of Gloucester, wasted the king's treasures, estranged him from the Duke of York, and generally failed to keep up good governance in the realm. They complain that members of parliament have been elected by the sheriffs without the proper forms, and that the old abuse of purveyance is practised by the royal household on a shameless scale, while the king's debts go unpaid. All this sounds like the proclamations of the Lords Appellant, rather than the programme of Tyler. Only one clause of the rebels' "articles of complaint" touched on a social grievance—it asks for the abolition of the Statute of Labourers.

X The leader of this insurrection, which swept all over Kent and Sussex in a few days, is generally known as Jack Cade; he resembles Wat Tyler only in the fact that his antecedents are hard to discover. He is variously called an Irishman and a Kentishman; some say that he had been a physician, others that he was a soldier of fortune returned from France. The government in their proclamation against him declared that he had been exiled for killing a woman two years before, but gave no other account of him. He himself asserted that he had been a captain under the Duke of York, and that his real name was Mortimer, which may possibly have been true, for there were

¹ See for example the "Dirge" on "Jackanapes" (Suffolk's nickname) in the *Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles*, Camden Society, pp. 99-103.

CHAP. several illegitimate branches of the house of March. He seems
 XV. to have been a man of some education and capacity, to have been able to organise an army, draw up a plan of battle, and dictate a sounding proclamation and a good list of constitutional abuses. Whether he was the tool of the magnates who hated the faction of Suffolk, or a ready-witted adventurer who rightly gauged the spirit of the times, and saw that the people were ready to take arms against the government the moment that a leader presented himself, it is impossible to say. The turbulent county of Kent had risen before, and was destined to rise again hereafter, under much less promising captains.

The insurrection began in mid-Kent about Trinity Sunday. Twelve days later Cade was encamped on Blackheath with several thousand men, not in a mere disorderly horde but duly arrayed under the constables of the hundreds, and reasonably well armed. Their proclamation, couched in moderate and constitutional language, was generally approved; indeed none, save the governing faction about the king, could venture to dispute the justice of their complaints or the reasonable nature of their demands. The rebels were granted some days of respite before they found any enemy opposed to them, but the lords of the council brought the king up to London, mustered all their retainers, raised the levies of London and the home counties, and on June 18 came forth to attack the rebel camp. Cade retired a few miles, but turned unexpectedly upon the van of the royal host, near Sevenoaks, routed it and slew its leaders Sir Humphrey and William Stafford, kinsmen of the Duke of Buckingham. On this the army broke out into mutiny and began to threaten the lives of the treasurer, Lord Say, and of other of the king's servants. The king was forced to disband the whole force, and fled through London to Kenilworth, leaving the capital undefended. On July 2 Cade seized Southwark and summoned the mayor of London to open his gates. Abandoned by the king and the lords of the council, the mayor Charlton refused to offer resistance. Next morning Cade rode on to London bridge, very fine in a gilt helm and a blue velvet brigandine; he severed the ropes of the drawbridge with his own sword, and when it fell, rode in at the head of his army. He smote London Stone with his sword, as he passed, crying, "Now is Mortimer lord of London," and dis-

mounted at the Guildhall, where he announced himself as "John Amend-all" come to execute judgment on traitors. He would appear to have kept his followers in good order this day; only one house, that of an unpopular alderman named Philip Malpas, was stormed and sacked. In the evening the Kentishmen withdrew quietly to their quarters in Southwark. Next day Cade returned to the Guildhall, and held a great session on three prisoners, Lord Say, the treasurer, Crowmer, late sheriff of Kent, and one John Bailey. He had got possession of Say and Crowmer's persons by the cowardice of the governor of the Tower, who surrendered them at his demand. The treasurer claimed the right to be tried by his peers, but Cade gave him a common jury and a swift sentence. He and his companions were beheaded that afternoon, and their heads set up over London bridge. The Kentishmen that night, with the aid of the London mob, sacked a number of houses belonging to officials and city magnates. This pillage was fatal to Cade, just as the massacres of Friday, June 14, 1381, had been fatal to Wat Tyler. It frightened the mayor into action, and induced the propertied classes to take arms. On the evening of the following day the party of order, strengthened by the garrison of the Tower, shut the gates and seized London bridge. Cade attempted to re-enter the city at the head of his troops, and there was a bitter battle lasting all night upon the bridge, in which Sir Matthew Gough and many more were slain. Cade's men could not force their way to the northern end of the defile, which was still held by the loyalists when day broke.

Next morning both parties were exhausted, and when the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, with Bishop Wainfleet of Winchester, offered to act as mediators, an armistice was concluded. The prelates promised, in the name of king and council, a complete amnesty to the insurgents if they would disperse. Seeing his men inclined to slacken in their exertions, and judging that he would find it hard to enter London again, Cade accepted these terms. One special pardon was drawn up for "John Mortimer," another embraced the names of hundreds of his adherents. Relying on the good faith of the three prelates, Cade tarried several days in Southwark, while his levies disbanded in an orderly fashion. On July 8, however, he was informed, much to his dismay, that his pardon was invalid,

CHAP. because there was no such person as "John Mortimer," and
 XV. John Cade had no promise of grace. Thereupon he fled, with a handful of followers, and some plunder which had stuck to his fingers during his short day of power. He was hardly gone when a proclamation appeared offering 1,000 marks for his body "quick or dead". On July 12 Alexander Iden, the sheriff of Kent, ran him down in a lane near Heathfield. He resisted arrest, and was mortally wounded in the scuffle. His corpse was quartered, and his head set up over London bridge. The Kentishmen, all too late for Cade's purpose, began to re-assemble when they found that their pardon was about to be annulled; but their new leaders William Parmynter and John Smith had not the ability of the old "captain"; the second rising flickered out, and the government was able to hang traitors at its leisure all round Kent. Cade's rebellion was not an isolated phenomenon: while he was in arms there were other riotous assemblies in Norfolk, Sussex, and Wilts. The men of the last-named shire murdered their bishop, Ayscough, at Edington and plundered all his manors, because he had been a good friend of Suffolk, "and a wonder covetous man, and evil beloved among the commone peeples, and suspect of many defaults".

Meanwhile Somerset's disastrous campaign in Normandy had come to its ignominious end, and he had taken refuge in Calais. So firmly rooted, however, was affection for the Beauforts in the hearts of the king and queen, that he was invited to return home and created Constable of England on September 11. By this insane act Henry defied the whole nation—all the late stir had been directed as much against Somerset as against Suffolk, Say, or any other member of the ministry. At this moment news reached the court that another and a less welcome visitor was at hand. Richard of York had watched from Dublin the course of the recent troubles, and, just as the Kentish insurrection was at an end, made up his mind to return home and put himself at the head of his party. Perhaps he was indignant that the name and cause of Mortimer were being profaned by the adventurer Cade; perhaps he was ready to take advantage of the work already done for him by the "captain of Kent," and designed to put himself at the head of an army already mustered in his behalf. Whichever

was the case he was too late ; when he landed in Wales early in August it was to learn that the rising had been suppressed. CHAP.
XV.

By throwing up his lieutenancy Richard of York had exposed himself to the accusation of treason : he had practically returned from exile without leave, and if the government felt strong enough, it might endeavour to seize and crush him. The news of his start had terrified the council ; they sent out the Lords Stanley and Lisle to meet him on the way, and forbid his approach to the king's person. But he eluded these messengers at Chester, took a long turn in the Welsh march to collect his retainers, and in September began to move on London with a considerable force at his back. His partisans came in from all quarters, but one of the most prominent of them, William Tresham, formerly speaker of the house of commons, was murdered in Northamptonshire by Lord Grey de Ruthyn, a member of the queen's clique ; this violent deed almost provoked a collision between the duke and the council. But York could not protest overmuch ; he also had committed a flagrant breach of the peace, by seizing on his way the Lord Dudley and the Abbot of Gloucester, and clapping them into one of his castles. Finally, he was admitted to the king's presence, to receive a polite reception, a promise that he should not for the future be excluded from the council, and an invitation to appear at a parliament summoned to meet at Westminster on October 6. He warned the king that nothing would go well in the realm till the traitors who had lost France had been put on their trial, and then betook himself to his castle of Fotheringhay, where he was joined by many of his friends and partisans.

When parliament met, the rivals York and Somerset were face to face, and it was felt that an open collision might occur at any moment. The peers on both sides had come up with enormous retinues, and London was filled with men-at-arms. York and his nephew, the young Duke of Norfolk, had large bands at their heels, but the forces of Somerset, backed by the Duke of Exeter and the Earl of Shrewsbury, were almost as large. The Commons were wholly on the side of York, and chose his chamberlain, Sir Thomas Oldhall, as their speaker. The chancellor, Archbishop Kemp, tried to distract the two factions from their quarrels by pleading the danger of Calais

CHAP. and Bordeaux, against which the French were certain to turn,
 XV. now that Normandy was all their own. But he got little attention; the one question interesting the nation at the moment was whether Somerset should or should not be brought to trial for his administration in France. On December 1 the Yorkists made an unconstitutional attempt to arrest him at Blackfriars, but he escaped in a barge, and made his complaint to the king, who a few days later prorogued parliament, and then marked his confidence in the "traitor" by appointing him captain of Calais. It is astonishing that no armed collision took place, but York showed himself more moderate than might have been expected, discouraged his friends from taking the law into their own hands, and consented to show his loyalty by presiding at some belated trials of followers of Cade. The executions that followed lost him much popularity: he was considered to have betrayed his own humble friends, who in their rising had wished him nothing but weal.

In January, 1451, the struggle began again. The Commons presented a petition that Somerset, the Lords Dudley and Hastings, the Bishop of Lichfield, the Abbot of Gloucester, and three or four other friends of Somerset, should be deprived of all their offices and banished for life from the court. The king refused to listen to any proposal for the banishment of Somerset, but made the useless concession of removing Dudley and the Abbot of Gloucester from his council. There followed confused and violent debating, which lasted till Easter without result; but when the houses reassembled a new note was struck, by the introduction of a petition by Thomas Yonge, member for Bristol, that the king would be pleased to declare the Duke of York heir to the throne. The majority of the Commons supported him, but the Lords were averse to the proposal, and the king not only rejected it, but dissolved the parliament on June 10, 1451. When the members had dispersed, he sent Yonge to the Tower.

The raising of the succession question by this indiscreet partisan of Duke Richard marks the beginning of the dynastic, as opposed to the constitutional, struggle between York and Somerset, and reveals the inward meaning of many of the movements of the last two years. All the chief factors in the genesis of the Wars of the Roses can now be traced in opera-

tion. They were many and various, and different historians in different ages have laid stress sometimes on one, sometimes on another section of them. Some find the key to the whole problem in the failure of "the great Lancastrian experiment"—the attempt of a dynasty whose title rested on popular election to govern the realm in partnership with parliament. Henry VI. by refusing to listen to the Commons, and retaining Somerset in office, may be considered to have violated the bargain which Henry IV. had made with the nation, and to have relapsed into the perverse habits of Edward II. or Richard II. Others can see in the Wars of the Roses nothing but a great faction fight for power, between two family alliances of over-great baronial houses, led respectively by York and Somerset. Others again seek their main cause in nothing more recondite than a disputed rule of succession—a strife between legitimacy and the ideal of elective kingship—between the claim of York to be the true lineal representative of Edward III. and the claim of Henry VI. to retain the crown conferred by parliament on his grandfather. To yet another set of observers the root of the whole matter is simply the incapacity of the reigning sovereign; they will have it that there would have been no war if Henry VI. had been less pious and simple, and Margaret of Anjou a less ardent supporter of Suffolk and Somerset. Again, it has been argued, with some plausibility, that the whole struggle was the just nemesis for the lawless spirit bred in the nation by forty years of unrighteous warfare in France, that it was inevitable that magnates who had become demoralised by a long career of military adventure should finally turn their swords against each other, since the traditions of faith, loyalty and moderation had been forgotten in the all-absorbing continental war.

There is some truth in every one of these views, though less in some than in others. Of the causes cited some operated more in the beginning of the period of strife, others are most traceable in its later part. The constitutional aspect of the struggle stands out clearly at its start, when the action of the Yorkists is closely parallel to the doings of the Lords Ordainers of 1310, or the Lords Appellant of 1387. But to look upon the outbreak of the war under Richard of York as a mere repetition of the risings of Thomas of Lancaster or Thomas

CHAP. of Gloucester, would be to miss half its meaning. York was
 XV. the representative of the old legitimist claim to the throne on the part of the house of Mortimer, which had so often been asserted since 1399. For many years he refrained from setting forth this claim, but it was never absent from his followers' minds. So long as Henry VI. remained childless, the duke was the heir presumptive to the crown, as well as the nearest of kin to Richard II., and he saw no reason to broach the one claim while the other was efficacious. The king had now been married for six years and had no issue; remembering the childlessness of so many of his uncles and aunts, most men had now begun to take it for granted that he would never have a son. The main question in practical politics was to determine who was his rightful heir.

The question of the succession needs a word of explanation. After the death of Humphrey of Gloucester there survived no male of the legitimate house of Lancaster save the king alone: from Henry's three uncles and two aunts there was no surviving issue born in wedlock.¹ The act of parliament which regulated the descent of the crown was that drawn up in the second, and revised in the third session of 1407.² The founder of the dynasty of Lancaster had made elaborate dispositions as to the order of inheritance among his descendants, but they had been rendered futile by the fact that all his line save the reigning king had vanished. Henry IV. had gone out of his way to enact that his legitimised brothers, the Beauforts, should not under any circumstances have a claim to the crown, this one exception being made to their complete recognition as members of the royal house. The act of 1407 had never been repealed, and if it held good, an heir to the throne must be sought elsewhere than in the house of Beaufort. Should that heir be found among the descendants of the daughters of John of Gaunt, the king's nearest blood relatives, or was he rather to be discovered in the representative of the eldest branch of the lineage of Edward III.? No one, as a matter of fact, seems to have urged the claims of any of the issue of Elizabeth, Philippa, or Katharine of Lancaster, who were now represented respectively

¹ Clarence had left a bastard son, and Gloucester a bastard son and daughter.

² See *supra*, pp. 205 and 207.

by Henry Holland, Duke of Exeter, Alfonso V., King of Portugal, and Juan II., King of Castile. They were only descendants of female lines, and if female lines were once counted, there existed a house senior to those of all the three Lancaster princesses, namely the Mortimers, the representatives of Lionel of Clarence, the elder brother of John of Gaunt. In 1399 Henry IV. had laid great stress on the fact that he was the next *male* heir of Edward III. ; if attention were to be paid to his views fifty years after, it was obvious that Richard of York was the only person, save Henry VI., who possessed an unbroken legitimate male descent from King Edward. He was in fact heir to the reigning sovereign, whether male or female claims were preferred.

But there remained to be taken into consideration the personal characters of Henry VI. and of his trusted minister Edmund, Duke of Somerset. Save for the act of parliament which disabled the Beauforts from succeeding to the crown, Somerset, with his complete male descent from Edward III. through John of Gaunt, might be regarded as possessing a better male claim than Richard of York. Was it likely that he would allow this inestimable advantage to be forgotten, when he held the king in the hollow of his hand? It would only require an act of parliament, slipped through a packed house on some favourable occasion, to annul the disabilities imposed on the Beauforts by Henry IV., and then Somerset's position would be set right. York and his friends expected that something of the kind would be attempted, so soon as the late defeats in Normandy should be forgotten by the nation. But there was a complication in the Beaufort claim ; Somerset had an elder brother, John, the unsuccessful general of 1443, who died without male issue, but left a single infant daughter. The succession act of December, 1407, provided that the daughter of an elder brother would succeed before her uncle, a younger brother. Many people remembering this, and forgetting that if the succession act was worth anything it barred the Beaufort claim altogether, reasoned that the child Margaret Beaufort had a superior claim to her uncle the present Duke of Somerset. In 1450 some of Suffolk's enemies declared that he had a plan for cheating his ally Somerset out of the succession, by marrying this little girl to his own eight-year-old son John

CHAP. de la Pole, that he might share her throne in case of Henry VI.'s
XV. early death. There is no proof that Suffolk ever really nourished such a plan, but the child Margaret did ultimately transmit the Lancastrian claim to the crown.

Thomas Yonge's motion that York should be declared heir to the throne placed Somerset and the king in a false position. If they assented to it, there could be no possibility in the future of raising the Beaufort claim; if they rejected it, they gave good grounds to York and his friends for suspecting that the Beaufort claim was about to be brought forward at the earliest possible opportunity. When therefore parliament was dissolved, and Yonge imprisoned, Duke Richard determined to defend his rights. He made no mention of his claim to the succession in his manifestoes, preferring to put himself forward as the advocate of good governance and liberty, against an incapable favourite and a misguided king. But the succession question lay at the back of all his policy, and if he carefully avoided any mention of it, his followers were not so discreet.

Richard of York could count on very powerful supporters. He had allied himself to the great house of Neville, who formed at this moment the strongest family group which England had ever seen. He had married Cicely, the daughter of that Ralph Neville, Earl of Westmorland, who had served Henry IV. so well against the Percies and Scrope. The title of Westmorland had fallen to the old earl's grandson, a nonentity, but the remainder of Ralph's descendants formed a notable party in the baronage, and always acted together. Richard Neville, his second son, had become Earl of Salisbury, by wedding the heiress of the last Montagu earl, who fell at Orleans. He was the managing spirit of the family. His son, another Richard, had lately married the heiress of the Beauchamps, and in 1449 had succeeded in her right to the earldom of Warwick. Two more of Salisbury's brothers had obtained, also by marriage, the baronies of Fauconberg and Abergavenny, another held the barony of Latimer. The five Neville peers formed an appreciable part of a house of lords which counted only some fifty lay members. In addition they were always supported by their relative, John Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, the son of Salisbury's sister, the greatest territorial magnate in the realm, and by Henry Lord Bouchier who had married York's sister. This

family group, devoted to the cause of Duke Richard, their kinsman, formed a nucleus round which the opponents of Somerset were wont to rally. There were many others who owed the king's favourite a grudge, such as the Lords Cromwell and Cobham, but the Neville connexion formed the heart of the Yorkist party. Almost the only member of the house who stood outside it was its titular head the Earl of Westmorland, who had quarrelled with his uncle Salisbury over the partition of the family estates; but he was an invalid and counted for little, though his retainers always took the field against rather than under the White Rose of York.

In discussing the military strength of the English baronage at this critical date it is important to remember that the power of a great peer did not depend on his own tenantry alone. The pernicious system of "livery and maintenance" was now at its height; the gentry of England in many districts had bound themselves by regular sealed bonds to follow their greater neighbours in peace and war. This system was as dangerous to the crown as the old feudalism of the twelfth century. A Neville or a Mowbray was strong enough with the band of "household men" whom he kept about his person, and with the bills and bows of his tenantry, but he was stronger still when all the minor landholders of Warwickshire or Norfolk had mounted the Ragged Staff or the White Lion and pledged themselves to take arms in his behalf in times of trouble. This custom had practically superseded the salutary system of earlier days, when even the smallest tenant-in-chief owned only the sovereign as his superior in war. The king could no longer count on raising a national army. He could only oppose to the levies of malcontent lords other levies, raised by lords who belonged to the court or ministerial party. Though some great houses, such as the Percies and the Staffords, which could place large forces in the field, adhered to the Lancastrian cause, and though the majority of the lesser baronage was not Yorkist in sentiment, the crown was deplorably weak.

As the head of a powerful baronial league, as the leader of the constitutional opposition in parliament, as the heir presumptive to the throne, Richard of York felt himself so strong that in the opening months of 1452 he resolved to secure the dismissal of Somerset from office by armed force. He issued

CHAP. a proclamation at Shrewsbury, in which he stated that, having
 XV. used all peaceful means for the removal of this corrupt and incompetent minister, he was now compelled to try other methods; if he delayed longer he would be destroyed by his enemy, who was moving the king to disinherit him and his heirs. He then set up his banner and marched on London; he was joined on the way by the Earl of Devon and Lord Cobham, but the Nevilles and Norfolk had not yet reached him when he turned aside into Kent, to recruit his army from that ever-turbulent county. This was a strategical error; the king had also collected a large force under Somerset, Buckingham, and Exeter. This army placed itself between the duke and London, cutting him off from the aid that might have come from the east and north. Negotiations were opened, and York offered to disband his host, if he were assured that Somerset should be removed from office, and forced to answer before parliament all the accusations brought against him. To this the king consented, or used such language as induced York to think that he had consented. Richard loyally dismissed his troops, and went almost unattended to visit the royal camp near Dartford. "But when he came to the king's tent the Duke of Somerset was still awaiting upon the king, as chief about him." York had been tricked through his confidence in the king's word; he was taken to London "like a prisoner and like as he should have been put in hold".¹ Apparently Somerset had persuaded the king that no faith need be kept with traitors. But Henry did not behead York. He made him swear a great oath upon the high altar of St. Paul's that he would never take arms again, forced him to a hollow reconciliation with Somerset, "and so the matter was put in a rule between the king and the said duke as for that time".²

Henry may very probably have made an appeal to York's patriotism, by pointing out that civil strife at home would be fatal to the last chance of preserving the remnants of the English heritage beyond the seas. The fate of Guienne was at this moment in the balance. In 1451 Charles VII. had turned his victorious arms from Normandy to the south. The Bastard of Orleans had captured one after another the outlying bulwarks

¹ *London Chronicle*, ed. Kingsford, p. 163.

² *English Chronicle*, ed. Davies, p. 70.

of Bordeaux; Bourg and Blaye had fallen in May, Fronsac and Libourne early in June. No succours arrived from England, where the parliamentary struggle of 1451 was then at its height, and on June 30 the inhabitants of Bordeaux, with manifest reluctance, surrendered their city. On August 20 Bayonne, the last fortress where the English banner flew, had opened its gates, and the subjection of Guienne seemed complete. But provincial independence was dear to the Guiennois; they were loyal in their hearts to Henry VI., and they chafed bitterly against the new taxes and the abrogation of old customs which the French conquest brought about. Within six months of the fall of Bayonne Gascon nobles and burghers were visiting London in secret, to pledge their faith that the whole province would rise in arms the moment that an English army showed itself on the Gironde. When the appeal was made to him not to wreck this fair chance of resuming the struggle with France, York, as the advocate of a vigorous war policy, could hardly refuse his aid. He consented, and a great effort was made to raise an army for the invasion of Guienne. In July, 1452, the veteran Talbot, who had been created Earl of Shrewsbury some years before, was commissioned to raise 3,000 men for that enterprise.

The struggle of York and Somerset was suspended for a year and more, while both parties gave their aid for this attempt to rescue the last remnant of the English dominion in France. Talbot landed on October 17 in the Médoc; on the 21st the Bordelais threw open their gates to him. Within a few weeks most of the places around the great city were once more English. Then came winter, and nearly six months of respite before the slow-moving Charles of France launched his armies against Guienne. By this time Talbot had received reinforcements from England under his son Lord Lisle; with their aid he won back Fronsac, which all through the reign of Henry VI. had been the frontier fortress of the English territory in Guienne. It was only in July, 1453, that the French appeared, in overwhelming force, and laid siege to Castillon on the Dordogne. Talbot marched out to its relief, with every man, Gascon and English, that he could collect. On the 17th he fell furiously upon the besiegers, who were stockaded in a great entrenched camp. So well were they covered that the old earl

CHAP. did not see how he could turn his archery, the real strength of
 XV. his army, to any account. Forming his whole force into a dense column, with the men-at-arms at the head, he marched straight at the trenches. Though torn to pieces by the French artillery, the assailants crossed the ditch, and strove time after time to force their way into the lines. They were repelled, and presently outlying contingents from other parts of the circumvallation came up, and began to take the English in flank and rear. At this moment Talbot was struck down by a cannon ball, which broke his leg. His sons and his body-squires fought fiercely in his defence, but were slain one after another. The French sallied out of their trenches, the English column broke up, and all was lost. Talbot and Lisle were found dead side by side, and all the flower of their host had perished.

Nothing can show better the loyalty of the Guiennois to the English cause than the fact that many of the smaller towns held out for two months after the disaster at Castillon, and that Bordeaux itself, though hopeless of succour, did not surrender till October 19, after it had stood a siege of eighty days. But this was the end; the French king took good care that his new subjects should not have another chance to rebel, and England for twenty years was in no condition to think of sending an army over seas. Yet the remembrance of their old connexion with the island realm long remained deep in the breasts of the men of Bordeaux; not only in the days of Edward IV., but so late as those of Henry VIII., secret messages were sent to England from the Gironde, and a vigorous attempt to recover Guienne might yet have found aid from within. Fortunately for both parties the attempt was never made.

If any further proof was wanted to convince the English nation that Somerset's government was hopelessly incapable, as well as hopelessly unlucky, it was the disaster of Castillon. Parliament had been dissolved on July 2, fifteen days before the battle. If the houses had received the news while still in session there would probably have been an outburst of wrath—though this parliament had shown itself more subservient to the present ministers than might have been expected. It had granted large supplies, confirmed all the king's late acts, and attainted York's retainer, Sir William Oldhall, the Speaker of 1451, for the part

that he had taken in the demonstration-in-arms at Dartford. Moreover, as if contemplating civil war, it had granted the king the enormous levy of 20,000 archers to be raised at the expense of the counties and the lords, whenever it should please him to call them out. But all this was done before the appalling tidings from Bordeaux came to hand.

Meanwhile, on August 10, King Henry was seized with a sudden access of insanity, the heritage, no doubt, of his grandfather, Charles VI. It was not sorrow at the evil news from Guienne which shook his feeble brain, but a sudden and casual fright: his grandfather's affliction, it will be remembered, had begun in the same fashion. He fell into absolute imbecility, sitting for days without moving or speaking; he had to be fed with a spoon, and lifted from his chair to his bed. Henry's insanity by itself might not have had any evil consequences. If it had been permanent the natural sequel would have been the appointment of York as regent of the realm. York the regent would in due time have become King Richard III., for there could have been no possibility of urging against him, when once he was in power, the feeble claim of the Beauforts to the crown. But on October 13, six days before the surrender of Bordeaux, Queen Margaret was delivered of a son. This unexpected event threw everything into confusion. The partisans of York were furious—some said that the child was supposititious, that the queen had foisted in a changeling now that her husband was unable to repudiate him. Others said that the child was Margaret's, yet that its father was not the king, but the queen's friend, James Butler, Earl of Wiltshire, "the best-favoured knight in the land, and the most feared of losing his beauty".¹ But the fact that York himself made no attempt to attack the legitimacy of the young prince seems conclusive against these rumours. If he had believed them, it is incredible that he would have permitted himself to be cheated out of the crown by such a shameless device.

It would appear that the queen and her friends kept the king's insanity secret as long as they could, and represented him as attacked by some casual illness; for only some time after the prince's birth was the question of a regency raised. At a great council held at Westminster to consider the matter,

¹ See *Engl. Chron.*, ed. Davies, p. 79; Fabian, p. 628; Basin, i., 299.

CHAP. when it at last became known, it was found that the ministers
 XV. had not even invited the Duke of York to be present. But the peers of his party were strong enough to insist that he must be summoned, and allowed to give his advice. It seemed so clear that public opinion would designate him as the proper person to be made regent, that the queen and Somerset put off any decision, and prorogued the parliament summoned for November 12 till February, 1454, in the vain hope that the king might recover his senses ere it should meet. This served them little: York soon got control of the council, and when his faithful partisan, the Duke of Norfolk, presented a "bill" demanding that "process be made upon the Duke of Somerset" and a commission granted to inquire into his deeds,¹ the petition was conceded, and in December the council ordered that the duke should be placed in custody in the Tower, pending an inquiry. Somerset's imprisonment forced the queen to come forward as the head of the court party. In anticipation of the coming session of parliament she drew up a document asserting her right to the regency, and to such appurtenances of it as the patronage of all civil and ecclesiastic offices, and a sufficient livelihood for the king, the prince, and herself. Meanwhile both her friends and her enemies were secretly arming, and when February came round the roads to London were crowded with carts conveying hidden stores of jacks and brigandines, and with retinues of "likely men" riding behind their masters in military array.²

On February 13, 1454, York opened the parliament, acting, on the council's nomination, as "lieutenant of the king". The sittings were stormy, and the impeachment of Somerset was revenged by a similar action on the part of the royalists, who impeached the Earl of Devon and Lord Cobham for joining in York's Kentish demonstration of 1452. They also petitioned that the king's son should be created Prince of Wales, after the usual fashion. Richard of York, very greatly to his credit, made no opposition to the proposal, and the patent of creation was sealed on March 15. Financial matters made no progress; the Commons refused to grant supply till they should have been

¹ For the "bill" see *Paston Letters*, ii., 290-92, and Newsletter in *Paston Letters*, ii., 295.

² See *Paston Letters*, ii., 297.

satisfied by the chancellor-archbishop as to the way in which their last gifts had been expended, and informed why the realm did not enjoy the "sad and wise" counsel which he had promised them in the preceding year. Kemp was old and feeble: he died suddenly, on March 22, while framing his justification and apology. His tenure of office had lasted for no less than eighteen years, and he was personally respected by both parties, so that his death was one more blow to the cause of peace. Five days later, after sending a deputation to Windsor to verify the king's helpless incapacity, the lords declared York "protector and defender of the realm"; he obtained all the powers, if not the actual name, of regent. He at once installed his friends in power, appointing his brother-in-law, Salisbury, chancellor; it was forty-four years since a layman had held the post. The archbishopric of Canterbury was given to Thomas Bourchier, Bishop of Ely, whose brother, Lord Bourchier, had married Isabella, York's only sister. Salisbury's young son, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, was admitted to the privy council. Somerset's post as governor of Calais was taken over by the protector himself, but the duke was not brought to trial as the extreme Yorkists demanded; the protector was content with keeping him safe in the Tower.

This was part of York's policy of moderation; for the sixteen months that King Henry remained imbecile, he refrained from crushing his enemies, though he took care that his friends should be rewarded. His conduct with regard to the succession to the crown was scrupulously correct; not a word was said about his own possible claims, and the rights of the Prince of Wales were acknowledged without hesitation. It would seem that Richard's ambition was satisfied by the prospect of the long regency that lay before him. His main attention was directed to enforcing order in the realm: foreign affairs did not press, for, though the French war still lingered on, King Charles seemed content with what he had won, and made no attempt either to attack Calais or to collect a fleet in the Channel. It was an immense relief to England that there were no longer any outlying garrisons in Normandy or Guienne crying aloud for succour. The protector's troubles were from domestic matters; he discovered that several lords of Somerset's faction were busy in framing confederacies and collecting stores

CHAP. of arms. This was especially the case in the north, where the
 XV. Duke of Exeter and the Percies were openly hiring men-at-arms and circulating proclamations. But when York paid a visit to the parts beyond Trent in June, they dared not offer open opposition; Exeter, though he had taken sanctuary, was arrested and put in ward at Pontefract Castle. The Percies retired to their own estates, and temporised for the moment.

Just as there appeared to be some prospect of order and good governance being restored, the king suddenly recovered from his fit of insanity at Christmas, 1454. This was the most unlucky of chances; the moment that he had come to himself, greeted his wife and acknowledged his son, Prince Edward, he proceeded to undo all the work of the last sixteen months. York's protectorship, of course, came to an end. Not contented with this, the king proceeded to dismiss the ministers who had served under York, not only Salisbury, the new chancellor, but the Earl of Worcester who had held the treasury since 1452, and so was not one of the protector's nominees. Somerset was released from the Tower and restored to the captaincy of Calais. Exeter was liberated from his prison at Pontefract. The queen's special friend, James Butler, Earl of Wiltshire, was created lord treasurer. If matters had gone no further than this, it is possible that Richard of York might have accepted the situation. But the queen and Somerset showed themselves determined to push their triumph to the uttermost. In May they summoned a council, to which neither York, Warwick, Salisbury, nor any other adherent of their cause, was invited. This body issued a summons for a great council—not a parliament—to meet at Leicester "for the purpose of providing for the safety of the king's person against his enemies". The Yorkists had given no excuse for any such proceedings; they had been living quietly on their estates since their dismissal from office. But when thus challenged they were ready to take up the gage, and to fight for their lives.

The moment that the summons to the council at Leicester was published, York, who lay at his castle of Sandal, called in his brother-in-law Salisbury to council; they armed their Yorkshire tenants and marched south, hoping to gather in friends on the way. But of all their adherents, only the young Warwick and Lord Clinton had joined them before the crisis came.

Norfolk, who was collecting a great force in East Anglia for their succour, was just a day late for the battle.¹ The total strength of York and his kinsmen was not over 3,000 men, nearly all drawn from the North and West Ridings. The movements of the rebel army were rapid. On May 20 it had reached Royston, on the 21st it was at Ware, close to London. At Royston the duke issued a manifesto directed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, explaining that he had been forced to take arms by the proclamation summoning the council at Leicester, seeing that he and his friends were the "mistrusted persons" against whom that document declared that action must be taken. From Ware he wrote another letter to the king himself, couched in laboriously apologetic terms, to the effect that he and his kinsmen were "coming in grace as true and humble liegemen, to declare and show at large their loyalty," but that they must demand instant admission to his noble presence, to the intent that they might convince him of the "sinister, fraudulent, and malicious labours and reports of their enemies".²

Long before this letter had been received, Somerset had learnt that York and Salisbury had marched south. He had at once directed his friends from all the parts of the realm to concentrate on Leicester.³ But for the moment Somerset and the king were surrounded by little more than the ordinary retinues of the lords of the council and the loyalist peers who chanced to be in London at the moment. Although they mustered less than 3,000 bows and bills, the number of great magnates present was imposing. Somerset had with him his young son the Marquis of Dorset, the Duke of Buckingham and his son Lord Stafford, the Earls of Northumberland, Devon, Pembroke, and Wiltshire, and the Lords Clifford, Dudley, and Roos—nearly a quarter of the peerage of England. They left London on their way to Leicester on May 21, slept that night at Watford, and had just reached St. Albans when they heard that York was close at hand. Somerset resolved to take up a defensive position, rightly believing that his adversaries had the advantage in numbers. St. Albans was a long straggling place, destitute

¹ See *Paston Letters*, iii., 30.

² *Rot. Parl.*, v., 281.

³ The Earl of Shrewsbury and others were coming to join them with 10,000 men, as was said. See *Paston Letters*, iii., 30.

CHAP.
XV.

of wall or gates; but he hastily barricaded all its outlets, and drew up his army under cover of the line of houses which formed the eastern part of the town. The royal standard was pitched in St. Peter's Street, the main thoroughfare. A long parley preceded the opening of hostilities. When he saw York's army, cautiously advancing from the east, the king sent out the Duke of Buckingham to demand of his cousin why he had appeared in arms against his natural lord. Richard replied in words of effusive loyalty, but ended by demanding that Somerset should be arrested and tried for treason. He would not be put off with promises that justice should be done, remembering the oaths sworn to him in 1452 which had never been kept. When this message was brought back by Buckingham the king, abandoning for once his accustomed mildness of speech, burst out into angry words. Rather than surrender any of the lords who were with him that day he would risk his own life in their quarrel. He would make an example of the traitors who had dared to raise a host against him in his own land. "By the faith that I owe to St. Edward and the crown of England, I will destroy them, every mother's son."¹

Receiving this uncompromising reply, York turned to harangue his troops. He declared that when their master refused them all reform, would not listen to their petitions, and threatened them with the traitor's shameful death, they had no alternative but to defend themselves by force of arms against the cruel malice of their enemies. Death in the field would be preferable to death on the scaffold. It was nearly noon when York formed his men in three columns, and attacked the barricades which blocked the three roads that led into St. Albans from the east. His first attempts to break in were beaten off with loss at all points. But the young Earl of Warwick, now for the first time displaying his quick military eye, had noted that although the royalists were strong enough to man the barricades, their numbers were but scanty to maintain the long straggling line of houses which formed the south-eastern part of their front. Gathering his retainers about him, he thrust his way through the closes and gardens of the houses of Holwell Street, and bursting open several of their back doors ran out into the main thorough-

¹ All this from the narrative in *Paston Letters*, iii., 25-29, save the fact that Buckingham was the envoy, which comes from Whethamsted.

fare of the town "between the sign of the Key and the sign of the Chequers," with shouts of "A Warwick! A Warwick!" and trumpets sounding. Though thus taken in flank, the royalists faced about and fought manfully to thrust back Warwick's men. But it was but for a short half hour; they were overmatched; a panic set in after the Duke of Somerset had been slain; Sir Philip Wentworth, who bore the royal standard, threw it down and fled, and the Earl of Wiltshire left the field too early for his good fame. Of the other magnates of the king's party, who fought the game out to the end, nearly all were slain or hurt. Besides Somerset, there fell the Earl of Northumberland and Lord Clifford; while Buckingham, Devon, Stafford,¹ and the young Dorset were wounded and taken. The only unwounded prisoner of note was Lord Dudley. The unfortunate king himself, who stood passively beneath his standard throughout the fray, received a slight wound in the neck from an arrow. His attendants led him aside into the little house of a tanner. York addressed his master in a short exculpatory speech, and led him with great reverence to a chamber prepared for him in the abbey, where his wound was dressed. It was so trifling that he was able to ride to London with his captors next morning.

The first battle of St. Albans was but a short scuffle in a street; it lasted in all but an hour, and the number of slain and wounded was small. As in all the engagements of the Wars of the Roses, the lightly armed archers and billmen of the defeated party flung down their weapons and got off with ease, while the nobles and knights, weighted with their ponderous double-sheathing of mail and plate, could retire but slowly and were caught and cut down. Not more than 120 persons in all perished, possibly as few as sixty: of forty-eight bodies buried by the abbot only twenty-five were those of unknown common soldiers, the others were lords, knights, squires, and officers of the king's household.² There was no massacre of fugitives or prisoners: the victors contented themselves with plundering the captives of their armour and their valuables; they let the common soldiers depart and held the gentlemen as hostages. The evil

¹ Who ultimately died of his wound though it was only an arrow through the hand.

² See *Paston Letters*, iii., 28, and *Chron.*, ed. Davies, p. 72.

CHAP. custom of putting to death all the men of rank who were cap-
 XV. tured, the most disgraceful characteristic of these wars, did not
 begin until after the battle of Wakefield, when enmities had
 grown far more envenomed than was yet the case.¹ York on
 this occasion behaved handsomely to the prisoners; only Lord
 Dudley was sent to the Tower; of the rest some were merely
 placed in the custody of known Yorkists, others were set free,
 on undertaking to acquiesce in the new *régime* which the duke's
 victory had created.

¹ I cannot agree with Sir James Ramsay (ii., 183) that a deliberate policy
 of slaying hostile leaders, for which Warwick was responsible, was now intro-
 duced by the Yorkists.

CHAPTER XVI.

FROM THE FIRST BATTLE OF ST. ALBANS TO THE BATTLE OF WAKEFIELD.

AFTER their victory York and his followers behaved with moderation in all respects. No regency was created; Duke Richard took the office of Constable of England, but nothing more. Warwick replaced the dead Somerset as captain of Calais; York's brother-in-law, Lord Bouchier, was given the treasury; Salisbury became chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster. The great seal was left with Archbishop Bouchier, who appears from henceforth as an undisguised partisan of the Yorkist cause. Within four days of his victory the duke caused a parliament to be summoned. As was usual in these times, the party that was for the moment in power had no difficulty in securing a majority for its own supporters in the Commons. Sir Thomas Wenlock, a dependant of Warwick, was elected speaker. With the lords it was more difficult to deal, more especially as York made a point of summoning every possible peer, even those who, like Buckingham and Wiltshire, had been in arms against him at St. Albans. Only Lord Dudley was put in the Tower.

CHAP.
XVI.

The houses sat from July 9 to 31, confirmed all the appointments made by York, and passed a general amnesty for all deeds done in the late civil strife. They discreetly resolved to throw all the blame for the "ill day of St. Albans" on Somerset, who was dead and could make no reply, and two of his underlings, Speaker Thorpe and one William Joseph. Warwick made an ill-advised attempt to add the name of Lord Cromwell, who was there to defend himself, but after a lively altercation in the upper house dropped his motion, and acquiesced in the amnesty. The opposition, indeed, was sufficiently well represented in both Lords and Commons, to make it necessary for the victorious

CHAP. party to be moderate. The most curious act of this parliament
XVI. was a bill to rehabilitate the name and loyalty of Humphrey of Gloucester, now eight years dead. The Yorkists, regarding themselves as his political heirs, thought well to procure the passing of a declaration that he had always borne himself as a faithful subject of the crown. That the duke was sincere in his attempt to secure a general pacification, and restore constitutional government, was shown by the fact that he allowed his declared enemy the queen to have charge of both her husband and her son. But Henry was seized by a second access of madness early in the autumn of 1455. This rendered necessary the creation of a protector, and parliament reassembled on October 12, to confer on York the same powers that he had held in 1453-54. On this occasion, however, he retained them for a very few months. In February, 1456, the king came to his senses again—a most unfortunate thing for England—and the duke, with scrupulous exactness, laid down the protectorship, though it would have been easy enough to protract it, under the pretence that the king was not fully competent to discharge the royal duties, as was indeed the case.

But though the protectorship had ceased, the Yorkist ministry established by the battle of St. Albans endured for seven months longer: it lasted in all from May, 1455, till October, 1456. The events of the period were not of much importance either at home or abroad. Charles VII. was quarrelling with his son the dauphin, and left England alone, though he was beginning to collect some warships in his Channel ports, where a French navy had not been seen for forty years. James II. of Scotland was more troublesome. Using the pretext that York was a usurper, and that his kinsman Henry VI. was in durance, he made a wanton but unsuccessful attack on Berwick in June, 1455. In the next spring he raided in person some of the border districts of Northumberland, thereby provoking an angry and contemptuous letter from Richard of York who defied him in the king's name. But getting no promise of support from France, the King of Scots resolved not to push matters to extremities, and York was soon after deprived of the chance of resenting national insults as his sovereign's representative.

Meanwhile there was a marked stagnation in domestic

affairs; there was a full expectation that something startling might happen at any moment, and few men committed themselves to independent action. But two inveterate enemies in the west, the Earl of Devon and Lord Bonville, indulged in a pitched battle outside the walls of Exeter on October 28, 1455, without much pretence that it had anything to do with loyalty to the king or the Duke of York. The earl had the better in the strife, and celebrated his triumph by entering Exeter, ransacking the cathedral, and putting the canons to ransom.¹ The relation of the local wars of these unruly peers to the main politics of the realm may be sufficiently understood, when it is stated that in 1452-54 Devon was inclined to side with York and followed him in his Kentish demonstration, while Bonville professed loyalty to the crown. But when in 1455 the earl changed about, and fought on the king's side at St. Albans, the baron at once became, and remained, a strenuous Yorkist. Their feud of October, 1455, cannot be considered in any sense as a genuine part of the Wars of the Roses. But it was a typical development of this age, when every private quarrel disguised itself either under the mask of devotion to the king, or that of interest in the constitutional grievances of the realm.

In October, 1456, the Yorkist ministry came to an end. The queen had taken off her husband and son into the midlands, far away from London and Kent, where her enemies were strong. While the court lay at Coventry, it was announced first that Lord Bouchier had been dismissed from the treasury, and six days later that his brother the archbishop had ceased to be chancellor.² In their places were substituted the Earl of Shrewsbury and William of Wainfleet Bishop of Winchester, both steady friends of the queen. It is to be noted, however, that Warwick was still left as captain at Calais, where he had been winning golden opinions by the vigorous way in which he brought the unruly garrison into order, and kept the peace of the seas. Nor was York at first disgraced or attacked; Henry assured him that the ministerial changes hid no snare against his person, and he allowed himself to be soothed, and left Coventry "in right good conceit with the king, but not in

¹ The only contemporary details of this business are those given in *Rot. Parl.*, v., 285.

² October 6 and 11 respectively.

CHAP.
XVI.

great conceit with the queen". Rumour had it that it was the influence of the Duke of Buckingham which had prevented Margaret from following up the dismissal of the Bouchiers by an attempt to "distress" the duke. It is a good testimony to York's desire to keep the peace that he allowed his partisans to be dismissed from power without making any stir, and endured for two years exclusion from his legitimate place as one of the chief advisers of the crown.

He even consented to be formally reconciled with the queen and all his other enemies, at the king's special request. After long negotiations, a curious ceremony took place on March 25, 1458. Henry walked in state to St. Paul's, behind him came the queen led by York, then followed Salisbury hand in hand with the young Somerset, the son of the man who fell at St. Albans, and Warwick hand in hand with the Duke of Exeter, with their respective adherents two and two. The events of the next two years afford a ghastly commentary on the futility of the sovereign's endeavours to secure a permanent pacification. Already hatreds were so deep and bitter that no one save the guileless king could believe that oaths of amity sworn before the altar could induce the two factions to abide in peace. The reconciliation was not rendered more convincing by the fact that the king tacitly made York and his relatives accept the responsibility for the outbreak of civil strife, by insisting that they should endow a chantry at St. Albans, where masses should be said for the souls of Somerset and those who fell with him, and should assign 6,000 marks to the widows of Somerset and Lord Clifford. The duke and the Nevilles, who disclaimed all blame for their doings in May, 1455, must have resented these terms though they submitted to them.

This ceremony fell in the very middle of the hollow truce between the queen's party and the Yorkists, which lasted from the dismissal of the Bouchiers in October, 1456, to the second outbreak of the civil war in September, 1459. It is astonishing that the suspension of arms endured so long, but the king's personal influence was all for peace; it was only by dint of constant suasion and malevolent suggestion that his wife could drive him on to action. His reluctance to take up the queen's quarrel was shared by many sincere loyalists, who thought it wrong to persecute York, so long as York gave no overt cause of offence.

Of this party the Duke of Buckingham and the chancellor Wainfleet were prominent members. Duke Richard on the other hand—not to speak of his genuine and oft-expressed dislike for making the first offensive move—must have been influenced by the knowledge that his constitutional position had been rendered much more difficult by the progress of events, since he first raised his banner as the champion of the rights of the nation in 1452. He was no longer the first prince of the blood and the natural heir to the throne. He could no longer pose as the deliverer of his sovereign from a minister who had lost France and was ruining England; Somerset was dead, and the queen had taken his place as the head of the clique which managed the king and misconducted the affairs of the realm. It was a perilous thing to attack the crown itself; yet if the cry against weak and corrupt governance were to be raised again, the responsible person named must be rather the queen than her adherents—the Earls of Wiltshire and Shrewsbury, Lord Beaumont, and the rest. These were insignificant persons, who were not known and hated everywhere, as Somerset had been. Till their conduct grew absolutely outrageous, it would be well to endure in patience, since it was by no means certain that public opinion would approve an attempt to repeat the armed protests of 1452 and 1455. Of raising the succession question, and claiming the old rights of the house of Clarence against usurping Lancaster, there is no sign that Richard of York had any intention at this time. Not till he had been hunted to desperation did he produce that plea, in the last month of his life. Meanwhile the longer that he abstained from action, the stronger would be his position at the moment when the enemy should push him beyond the limit of endurance. For there were numerous peers who would take his side if they thought he was suffering oppression, yet would not support him in an offensive movement against the crown. It was the fact that both parties had much to gain by having public opinion on their side, and seeming to throw the crime of aggression on their rivals, that accounts for the putting off of the second outbreak of civil war for so long a period as three years.

These three years, as was perhaps to be expected, were a time of misery and mortification for England. The queen and her friends were too much occupied in watching York, and

CHAP. maturing their schemes against him, to have much energy left
XVI. for directing the external or internal policy of the realm. To show the unconstitutional character of their governance, it is sufficient to say that they did not call a single parliament during their ascendancy. They could not trust the nation, and instead of assembling the Commons summoned only one or two "great councils," which, owing to the Lancastrian majority among the lords, were safer to deal with. The first of these meetings after the dismissal of the Bouchier ministry appointed York Lieutenant of Ireland for ten years. But Duke Richard would not leave the realm. Like many of his predecessors, he appointed deputies, and stolidly refused to return to the seat of his old governorship of 1448-50. The ministers were not strong enough to force him to depart.

As regards foreign affairs the year 1457 was most disastrous. Pierre de Brézé, the seneschal of Normandy, had at last organised a strong French fleet in the Channel. The government took no measures to guard against its action, and in August sixty sail of Norman and Breton ships stood over to Sandwich, and threw ashore a landing force which captured and sacked the town. A few days later the Breton section of the fleet surprised and burnt Fowey. They met with no opposition at all upon the sea; the Duke of Exeter, the lord admiral, was caught wholly unprepared. It was not till October, when the enemy had sailed home with their plunder, that he succeeded in equipping a small squadron, with which he made a useless cruise as far as La Rochelle. So great was the indignation against him that the queen could not prevent the great council which met in November from conferring on the Earl of Warwick, Yorkist though he was, a commission to "keep the sea" for three years. He had done so well at Calais that, even to those who were not his friends, he seemed the natural person to entrust with the defence of the Channel. This, of course, told against the queen's ultimate design for the ruin of York and all his relatives. But even more damaging to her was the fact that she was believed, probably without foundation, to have been more or less responsible for De Brézé's raid. There is no doubt that she was, at the time, for her own personal and dynastic ends, in communication with Charles VII., the national enemy, and her detractors drew the deduction that the informa-

tion as to the defenceless state of the south coast had been obtained from her.¹

CHAP.
XVI.

Warwick entirely justified the confidence that had been placed in him. Not only did he keep the unruly garrison of Calais in hand, supplementing the meagre money grants made to him for its sustenance out of his own pocket, but he led it out on many successful raids as far as Etaples, Gravelines, and St. Omer. He induced the Kentishmen to victual the town for him when it was threatened with a siege in May, 1457. When the command at sea fell to him in the November of that year, he turned to this additional work with characteristic energy. In 1458 he fought two considerable engagements in the Dover Straits, one of which was reckoned "the gretest batayle there has been upon the see this forty wyntyre". This was a victory over twenty-eight Castilian ships, six of which were captured, on May 29.² But Warwick's second exploit had somewhat of a piratical character. Late in the summer he happened upon a great fleet of Hanseatic vessels from Lübeck; they refused to strike their flags to salute him. Now it had always been the claim of our admirals, since the days of Edward III., that foreigners must dip their ensigns on meeting an English squadron of royal ships, to acknowledge the *dominium maris* in the narrow seas. That suzerainty was now a most disputable and precarious one, so that the conduct of the Germans was unwise rather than unjustifiable. Warwick, in high wrath, fell upon them, and took five after a stiff fight. The Hansa made their complaint to the council, and the queen appointed a board consisting of Lord Rivers, Sir Thomas Kyriel, and seven other commissioners, to investigate the matter, with the intention of making it an excuse for relieving Warwick of his command.

The earl came over to London to defend himself; he was brought before the privy council, where the ministers proposed to supersede him and to give his posts to the young Duke of Somerset, a mere lad with no military experience, save that he

¹The French chronicler Mathieu d'Escouchy speaks of Margaret's connexion with De Brézé's raid as generally known. But it seems incredible that she could have consented to anything which must infallibly damage her own friends now in office.

²For the interesting personal adventures of John Jernyngham (or "Jernigan") in it, see *Paston Letters*, iii., 129-131.

CHAP.
XVI.

had been present at the battle of St. Albans, where he received a wound. Warwick, however, took his stand on the fact that he had received the captaincy of Calais by a parliamentary grant, and could only be deposed by a parliament. He was fully aware that the queen's friends did not wish to summon such an assembly. The matter ended in violence; on the second day of his appearing before the council, November 9, 1458, he was set upon by some of the retainers of Somerset and Wiltshire, and barely escaped with his life, reaching his barge by the merest chance, while three of his attendants were slain.¹ Warwick declared that this was a deliberate attempt at a political assassination; his enemies would have had it pass as an accidental scuffle. Their version was that a brawl had broken out between the earl's men and some royal servants, one of whom was hurt, thereupon the rest, aided by retainers of other persons, fell upon Warwick, as he was leaving the council, without any premeditation or any setting on by their employers. It must be confessed that this is not a very convincing story. Warwick, after a hasty interview with his father Salisbury and his uncle York, retired to Calais, where he was so strongly established that the queen and her friends dared not, as yet, make any open attack upon him. In the following summer he had another notable success at sea, against a small squadron of Castilian and Genoese carracks, three of which he captured, with goods to the value of £10,000.²

As to domestic affairs in these years, there still continued to be an intolerable amount of private war and disorder in the outlying corners of the realm. In 1457 the king had to repair to Hereford in person, in order to suppress some riots raised by Sir William Herbert, a knight of Yorkist proclivities. In the next year the old feud between Percies and Nevilles burst out again in Yorkshire, and a skirmish, which almost reached the dignity of a battle, was fought between them at Castleton in the North Riding. From the fact that the king's justices held the Percies to blame, and fined them 16,000 marks,³ we must conclude that there was no chance of saddling the Nevilles with the responsibility. These are only prominent examples

¹ *Chron.*, ed. Davies, p. 78; Whethamsted, i., 340; Wavrin, v., 272.

² Whethamsted, i., 330.

³ For details of the fine, see Whethamsted, i., 303.

of the disorders which prevailed in many parts of England during this unhappy time. They were so much a matter of course that the chroniclers give us few details concerning them.

The one event which does stir the pen of contemporary writers to activity at this moment was the curious episode of the trial and condemnation for heresy of Reginald Pecock, Bishop of Chichester. This affair may have had its political aspects, for the bishop was a loyalist, and his chief accusers partisans of York. Pecock was a clever and eccentric Welshman, who held opinions which we can only call rationalistic. He was a great opponent of the Lollards, and it was by the unusual weapons of argument which he employed against these unfortunate sectaries in his *Repressor of over-much Weeting of the Clergy*, and other controversial works, that he got into trouble. The followers of Wycliffe were wont to test all the institutions and doctrines of the medieval Church by the appeal to Scripture. Pecock replied by asserting that things useful and necessary might and did exist, for which no scriptural authority could be quoted, simply because they had arisen since the days of the apostles. Such institutions or dogmas might be justified by the appeal to "reason" or "moral law". For, independent of revelation vouchsafed in the Scriptures, there existed for man's guidance the divine and immutable commands of that moral law which is part of the universe, and which dates back to ages long before Moses wrote or Christ walked on earth. By setting up a primitive and non-Christian criterion of right and wrong, which was to be interpreted for each man by his own reason, Pecock shocked the theologians of his own day quite as much as if he had advocated the most extreme Lollardy. It availed him not that his own personal "reason" taught him that such things as pilgrimages, the authority of the pope, monastic vows, or endowed clergy, were excellent institutions. He ought to have believed in their merit because the Catholic Church had formally approved them, not because his own private judgment did so.

But unfortunately for Pecock his reason, if it accepted such institutions as these, disliked certain other things, dogmas as well as practices, which were equally dear to the ordinary Christian of his own day. He cast doubt on the infallibility of the Church in matters of faith, and on the existence of

CHAP. "one Holy Catholic Church," and of a "Communion of Saints"
XVI. in the sense in which these words were commonly interpreted. Apparently he would have accepted the possibility of the existence of several Christian Churches side by side, differing in details of faith yet all orthodox. He had a particular distaste for the clause of the creed which describes our Lord as "descending into hell". Some say that he doubted the personality of the Holy Ghost.¹ It would seem that he had the temerity to issue a mutilated form of the Apostles' Creed, in which all the clauses for which he had a distaste were omitted; in justifying this publication he added that the creed was never taught by the apostles and belonged to a much later age. It was no wonder, after this, that certain theologians, both friars and secular teachers in the universities, delated Pecock to the primate as a manifest heretic. After reading nine of his books and pamphlets, Bouchier cited him to defend himself; he was tried in the king's presence and with the members of the privy council sitting by. At first he stood to his opinions and made much argument. But when the archbishop told him with brutal frankness that if he adhered to such views he would most certainly be handed over to the secular arm, and burnt like any Lollard, the unfortunate man gave way. Like so many of his opponents, the disciples of Wycliffe, he preferred abjuration to the stake. He owned to six heresies,² first privately before the king and the primate, then openly at St. Paul's Cross before a great multitude on December 4, 1457. His books were burnt, he was made to resign his bishopric, and for the rest of his life he was confined in the abbey of Thorney.

*Sic deplumatus Pavo fuit, et spoliatus,
Sicque sibi siluit, vox quia rauca fuit,*

writes that insufferable poetaster Abbot Whethamsted, who was about as competent to understand Pecock's doubts and difficulties as he was to produce a decent copy of Latin elegiac verse.³

¹ Bouchier at any rate made him abjure this heresy in his confession. It is not to be proved from his existing works that he actually had taught it.

² *Viz.* (1) Denial of the descent into Hades; (2) Denial of the personality of the Holy Ghost; (3) and (4) Denial of the "Holy Catholic Church" and the "Communion of Saints"; (5) Denial of the necessity to receive the verdict of a general council as infallible; (6) Assertion of the right to private judgment in interpreting the Scriptures.

³ Whethamsted, i., 288.

But even the trial and fall of Pecoek was but a momentary distraction to those who were watching without hope the general trend of politics. The chroniclers reflect the general unease: "the realm of England was out of all good governance—as it had been many days before: the King was simple and led by covetous counsellors, and owed more than he was worth. His debts increased daily, but payment was there none, for all the manors and possessions that pertained to the crown he had given away, so that he had almost nought to live on. For these misgovernances the hearts of the people were turned from them that had the land in governance, and their blessing was turned to cursing. The Queen and such as were of her affinity ruled the realm as they pleased, gathering riches innumerable. The officers of the realm, and especially the Earl of Wiltshire, treasurer of England,¹ for to enrich himself plundered poor people, and disinherited rightful heirs, and did many wrongs. The Queen was defamed, that he that was called the Prince was not the King's son, but a bastard gotten in adultery."² There was no parliament held, so that there was no means of bringing pressure to bear upon the king or his ministers. Even war itself would be better than this weary waiting for it.

It was not till the spring of 1459 that Queen Margaret thought herself ready to strike. Even then the blow lingered: as early as April writs were being sent out in the king's name to all save known Yorkists, bidding them be ready to assemble at Leicester on May 10, "with as many men as they might, defensibly arrayed".³ This levy must have been countermanded, for no army assembled, and in May and June the queen was in Lancashire and Cheshire, "allying to her the knights and squires in these parts, for to have their benevolence, and held open household among them, and made her son give a livery blazoned with a swan to all gentlemen of the country, trusting through their strength to make her son king; for she was making privy means to lords of England to stir the King,

¹ Wiltshire had superseded Shrewsbury in October, 1458. He was a greater favourite with the queen, though Shrewsbury was a sound royalist.

² *Chron.*, ed. Davies, p. 79.

³ The Pastons got their summons on April 29, see *Paston Letters*, i.,

CHAP. to resign the crown to his son; but she could not bring her
XVI, purpose about".¹

It was the news of these Cheshire confederacies, as it would seem, that finally drove the Yorkists into action. Yet they were as leisurely as the queen in coming to the point; apparently it took time for York, who was at Ludlow, and Salisbury, who was at Middleham, in the North Riding, to get into touch with Warwick at Calais. In July, two months after the queen's advent to Cheshire, they are said to have begun to arm in secret.² But September arrived before any open muster took place. It is clear that by this moment both parties were forewarned and forearmed; the only doubt is as to whether the first actual move was made by the queen, or by Salisbury, the earliest of the Yorkists to stir. The king and queen, surrounded by the nucleus of an army, were marching from Coventry northwards by September 12. Whether this march was caused by Salisbury's leaving Middleham at the head of his Yorkshire retainers, or whether on the other hand it was the news of the king's advance which led the earl to hurry off to join his kinsman York, it seems impossible to discover. Whichever was the case, the royal army missed the earl by taking a course too far to the east; while it was making for Nottingham and York, he passed west of it and reached Newcastle-under-Lyme on September 22. The king and his host, which was growing in numbers very rapidly, as distant contingents came in, was close behind in pursuit, less than a march away.

Salisbury, whose force was a small one, had no wish to fight, and only aimed at slipping off to join Duke Richard at Ludlow. But as he marched he found his way intercepted, at Blore Heath near Market Drayton, by the levy of Cheshire, under the Lords Dudley and Audley, which was hastening in to join the royal army. They had three to one against him,³ but he was forced to fight them, for the king was coming on close in his rear and he had no retreat open. Salisbury took up a hasty position in the edge of a wood, and waited to be attacked. The enemy made a series of vigorous but ill-concerted assaults on his line,

¹ *Chron.*, ed. Davies, p. 79.

² *Rot. Parl.*, v., 349.

³ Whethamsted, i., 338. The abbot says that the Yorkists were "*pauci, sed docti, strenui, et bene exercitati*," the royalists a "*multitudo paene decem millium*,"

and presently, after repeated repulses, lost heart and quitted the field. Of their two chiefs Dudley was taken prisoner and Audley slain; with him fell the flower of the Cheshire knights, Sir Hugh Venables, Sir Thomas Dutton, Sir Richard Molineux, and many more.¹

CHAP.
XVI.

The van of the royal main army reached Eccleshall, only six miles away, that same evening. The Yorkists would have been attacked and overwhelmed next morning had they tarried, but they marched off under cover of the darkness. The royal scouts had got into touch with them, but failed to detect their retreat, "because an Austin friar shot off guns all night in the park at the rear of the field, so that they knew not that the earl was departed. Next morrow they found neither man nor child in that park save the friar only, and he said that it was for fear that he abode in that park,"² firing the guns, apparently to keep up his heart. Salisbury therefore got off unmolested, and joined York at Ludlow. A few days later the Earl of Warwick also came in. He had left Calais with 200 lances and 400 archers of the garrison, landed in Kent, and slipped across the midlands without being intercepted by any of the numerous contingents of royalist levies which were hastening in from all quarters to join the king. At Coleshill, in Warwickshire, he only missed by a few hours a collision with the Duke of Somerset, but the two parties crossed without discovering each other's presence.

York, Warwick, and Salisbury, when they had united their forces, advanced as far as Worcester, ostensibly with the purpose of laying their grievances before the king, who had now moved to Kenilworth. In spite of the small victory of Blore Heath they found themselves in a very perilous position, for hardly any one save their own personal retainers had joined them. Of all the English peers only Clinton and Grey of Powys were in their company, but the Duke of York had brought out his two eldest sons, Edward, styled Earl of March, and Edmund, styled Earl of Rutland, to join the array, though they were only seventeen and sixteen years of age re-

¹ I cannot find any contemporary authority for the manœuvres attributed to Salisbury and Audley in Sir J. Ramsay's *Lancaster and York*, ii., 214. They seem to be ingenious surmises of local antiquaries.

² Gregory's *Chronicle*, p. 204.

CHAP.
XVI.

spectively. It would seem that many lords and knights who were generally considered Yorkists, and were gravely discontented with the queen's governance of the realm, were yet unwilling to join the duke's standard, because they considered that he had taken arms prematurely and without sufficient provocation. Here indeed lay Richard's difficulty; if he had armed a moment later he would have been caught unprepared by the queen; but by concentrating his forces before he had actually been assailed by her, he offended public opinion, and earned the odium of being the apparent, if not the real, aggressor. Of the peers upon whose votes in parliament and whose aid in the field he thought that he could rely, many stayed at home and some joined the royal muster.

In Worcester cathedral York, Salisbury, and Warwick took a solemn oath upon the high altar that they meant nothing against the king's estate or the common weal of the realm. They charged the Prior of Worcester and Dr. William Lyndwood to lay before the king a declaration "that they would forbear and avoid all things that might serve to the effusion of Christian blood," and retired before the royal army when it marched against them, recrossing the Severn into the marches of Wales. The king halted some days at Worcester, to rest his foot-soldiery who were tired by their countermarch in pursuit of Salisbury.¹ In reply to the declaration of the insurgents he sent them a letter borne by Bishop Beauchamp, a kinsman by marriage of Warwick, in which he offered a general pardon provided that they at once laid down their arms and dismissed their army. This York refused to do, urging in respectful but uncompromising terms that he had been pardoned and promised peace several times already, but that royal pardons in these days were a broken reed.² They had not prevented him from being excluded from the royal council, and treated like a common outcast. He dared not expose himself unarmed to the malice of the men about his master's person. What happened to those who came to court relying on the king's protection, might be seen from the case of his nephew Warwick, who had narrowly escaped assassination in the very palace of Westminster in the preceding November. Their master must

¹ Whethamsted, i., 338.

² *Ibid.*, i., 341.

find them some more valid security than a general pardon, if they were to take the risk of appearing before him unarmed and unattended. CHAP. XVI.

On receiving this answer the king set out in pursuit. The preamble of an act of the parliament of the following November tells us that Henry buckled on his armour "and spared not for any impediment or difficulty of the way, nor intemperance of weather, but jeopardied his royal person and continued in labour, sometimes lodging in the bare field for two nights together with all his host".¹ The enemy fell back gradually before him, till on October 12 he had almost reached Ludlow, and was separated from the duke's forces only by the flooded meadows along the Teme. Two days before he reached Ludlow he received another communication from the insurgent lords, protesting that they had retired before him from county to county and from place to place, out of mere reverence for his royal person, and throwing upon him the responsibility for pressing his loyal subjects into a most unwilling resistance. The dejected tone of this epistle resulted from the fact that York's army was in a state of deep discouragement and ready to disband. They were manifestly outnumbered, no help from England was reaching them, and Wales was in arms in their rear. The king had issued a proclamation promising free pardon to all save the chiefs, and many of the rank and file were anxious to accept it. Duke Richard, it is said, took the last desperate step of putting about a rumour that Henry was dead, and ordered his chaplains to sing masses for his soul.² But the stratagem recoiled on his own head next day, when Henry was seen riding under his banner, and marshalling his host on the other side of the river. The floods still prevented an engagement, and no more fighting took place than the exchange of some fruitless cannon-shots across the waste water, on each side of Ludford Bridge.

That night the Yorkist host went to pieces; Sir Andrew Trollope, an old soldier of fortune who was commander of Warwick's Calais lances, started the desertion by going over to the hostile camp with his men. Others followed his example, and many more, though too generous to join the enemy,

¹ See *Rot. Parl.*, v., 337.

² *Ibid.*, v., 338.

CHAP
XVI.

thought it no shame to make off to their homes under cover of the darkness. It was in vain that York, Salisbury, and Warwick tried to keep together the dissolving mass. The dispersion was so sudden and complete that they saw that they must fly before the king's forces crossed the Teme. The duke with his younger son, Edmund of Rutland, and two or three squires, rode off into Wales, with the intention of taking ship for Ireland, where he trusted that his deputies might still be faithful and give him shelter. Warwick, with his father Salisbury and the young Earl of March, resolved to attempt the more hazardous journey to Calais, though it involved a wild ride across half a dozen shires before they could reach the Channel. So hasty was the flight of the Yorkist lords that the duke himself had not time to carry off his wife and his two younger boys from Ludlow Castle.

For many days no one in England knew what had become of York or the earls, indeed their whereabouts was hardly ascertained when on November 20, 1459, some five weeks after the "rout of Ludford," the king opened a parliament at Coventry. The moment that the fortunes of war had declared in his favour, the queen had directed her spouse to issue writs for the assembly of the two houses, who had not met for three years.¹ All peers save those actually in arms under Duke Richard were summoned, including ancient supporters of his cause, such as Norfolk, Bouchier, and Bonville, who had not joined him on this occasion, and even Lord Stanley, who had raised his retainers in Lancashire, yet had failed to report himself at the royal headquarters, evidently because he was waiting to see which way fortune would turn. The elections to the Commons were conducted with even greater disregard for legal forms than was usual in this age. In many cases knights of the shire were returned by the sheriffs without any assembly of the freeholders having been held at all.² The lower house, in short, was little more than an assembly of Lancastrian nominees.

Such a parliament was prepared to carry out any orders that it might receive from the queen and her advisers. Its main work was to pass a great bill of attainder against the

¹ The writs are dated October 9, four days before the rout of Ludford.

² *Rot. Parl.*, v., 367, 374.

Yorkists. In it there appear the names of Duke Richard, Salisbury and Warwick, the Lords Clinton and Grey of Powys, Thomas and John Neville, sons of Salisbury, two Bouchiers, Edward and John, younger sons of Lord Bouchier and nephews of York, Oldhall and Wenlock, the speakers of the two parliaments of 1450 and 1455, a number of knights belonging to leading Yorkist families, among whom we notice the names of Harrington, Parr, Conyers, Dynham, Stanley, Hastings, and Vaughan, and a few squires and lawyers. There is one female name in the list, that of Alice Countess of Salisbury; why she was attainted, when the Duchess of York and the Countess of Warwick were left unmentioned, it is impossible to say: it was an evil precedent in any case. All these persons were adjudged to suffer the penalties of high treason; but the king, when assenting to the bill, declared that he reserved for himself the right of pardoning such of them as he should please. Whether with or against the will of the queen and her advisers, he used this right in the cases of the few persons named in the list who were in his power. Grey of Powys, who had come into the royal camp on the morning after the rout of Ludford, was pardoned, though his estates were forfeited. Thomas and John Neville were not executed, as they might have been under the attainder, but only imprisoned. It is probable that the king's personal leanings to the side of mercy were helped by the fact that so many of York's ancient friends, like the primate, Norfolk, Lord Bouchier and Bonville, had remained loyal during the rising. To confirm them in their present attitude it would be the best policy to show mercy to their friends and relations. On the whole the vengeance wreaked upon the vanquished cannot be said to have been excessive.

The session of parliament ended with a solemn oath taken by all the lords present, binding them not only to preserve allegiance to the king, but also to accept Edward Prince of Wales as the natural-born heir to the throne, a sufficient hint that (whatever loyal declarations Duke Richard might have made) it was generally believed that the Yorkist claim to the crown was a practical danger which had to be faced. The oath was taken by the two archbishops, three dukes, sixteen bishops, five earls, two viscounts, twenty-two barons, and sixteen abbots

CHAP. and priors. Among the signatories are found the following
XVI. magnates who declared for the Yorkist cause in the following year: Archbishop Bourchier, the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Salisbury, Exeter, and Ely, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Arundel, the Lords Bourchier, Bonville, Stourton, and Grey de Ruthyn.

It seemed for a moment that the cause of Lancaster was at last secure, and if the king's government had been conducted with a discreet mixture of firmness and moderation for the next twelvemonth, it is probable that the attainted lords might have become mere helpless exiles. But two things were necessary, prompt action in pursuing them to, and evicting them from, the remote strongholds whither they had fled; and wise, firm, and merciful governance at home, which might prevent the nation from regretting the triumph of the victorious party. The queen and her friends failed in both these points; they allowed their enemies time to rally and reorganise their scattered forces, while their administration of the realm continued to be as weak, arbitrary, and selfish as in the old days of Suffolk and Somerset. Brigandage was as rife as ever, and the leading loyalists joined in it; Ormond and Scales, for example, sacked Newbury without any reasonable excuse. Worst of all, Margaret soon began that policy of bloodshedding which was to be the special shame of the later epoch of the Wars of the Roses.

In all the realm within the seas Denbigh Castle was the only place which held out for York after the rout of Ludford,¹ but on the other hand the most important outlying possessions of the crown were secured by the fugitive lords. Duke Richard was welcomed at Dublin "as if he had been a second Messiah".² The barons of the Pale affected to treat him as being still the legitimate lieutenant of Ireland, and the Earls of Kildare and Desmond did him homage, influenced no doubt by the fact that the hereditary enemy of the Fitzgeralds, James Butler Earl of Ormond and Wiltshire, was the queen's favourite and counsellor. Richard was ere long enabled to hold an Irish parliament in full form, which recognised him as the only

¹ It was besieged by the Earl of Pembroke and held out till March, 1460.

² Whethamsted, i., 367.

representative of the crown within the island, and declared resistance to him to be treason. The queen should have attacked the duke without delay; but instead of shipping forces from England, she stirred up the "wild Irish" of the inland against him—thereby making him the idol and champion of the Englishry, and causing grave scandal even in England; for to call in, even against a rebel, the wild septs, whom public opinion regarded as savages, was thought unbecoming. Save for their raids into the Pale, York was destined to remain undisturbed for six months; and by the summer of 1460 he was established in a formidable position.

CHAP.
XVI.

His nephew Warwick accomplished far more to restore the cause of York, and that with less resources to his hand. After the rout of Ludford he had fled southward, accompanied by his father Salisbury, the young Earl of March, Sir John Dynham and two other persons only. Eluding many perils they reached the south coast of Devon, where Dynham, the only one of the party who had money with him, bought a fishing smack for 220 nobles, and hired four mariners. Warwick, who had ranged the Channel for two years while "keeping the sea," managed and steered the little vessel himself, and took her across to Guernsey in safety.¹ Here the fugitives were eight days wind-bound, but putting to sea again on the ninth, Warwick brought his party in safety to Calais on November 3. Here he found to his relief that the garrison was still true to him; his uncle, William Neville Lord Fauconberg, had succeeded in keeping them in hand, and had refused to submit to the victorious Lancastrians.

On the very evening of Warwick's arrival there came ashore at Calais the herald of the Duke of Somerset, who had been nominated as captain of Calais by the queen, and had arrived at Sandwich with a small force. He sent to bid Fauconberg surrender the town to him, not knowing that Warwick had returned to his stronghold. Though informed that there was no prospect of a peaceful entry into Calais, Somerset sailed next day, having with him Sir Andrew Trollope and many of the mer-

¹ For a very interesting account of this voyage see Wavrin, v., 277. The exact personal details in the narrative make one think that this must have been one of the first-hand tales which Wavrin had from Warwick when he visited him in 1469.

CHAP.
XVI.

cenaries who had deserted in his company on the night of the rout of Ludford. He established himself at Guisnes, but soon found that he was far too weak to make a serious attack on Calais. Indeed he would have been in danger of destruction if he had not got help from the French of Boulogne. But this leaguings with the national enemy did his cause much harm. It was soon known all round England that the queen's party was in alliance with the French, no less than with the wild Irish. Somerset, isolated at Guisnes with a few hundred lances, was helpless. The royalist ministers should have taken measures to reinforce him with a whole army ere Warwick grew stronger. Instead of doing this they merely sent Lord Rivers to Sandwich with some trifling reinforcements, which were to cross to Guisnes as soon as the weather permitted. But Warwick took the offensive; on January 7, 1460, he sent out an expedition of 400 men under Sir John Dynham and Sir John Wenlock, who landed at Sandwich in the dusk of the dawn and surprised the enemy in their beds. Rivers and his son, Antony Woodville, were taken off to Calais, and with them all the ships in the port, which were to have carried the reinforcements to Somerset.

This brilliant *coup-de-main* delivered Warwick from any danger of being attacked, till the enemy should have collected more ships and another body of troops. But the queen and her friends were very tardy in their operations during these critical months. The Duke of Exeter was bidden to gather a fleet, and Lord Audley and Osbern Mundeford, once captain of Le Mans, were to collect a large force at Sandwich; but it was not till April that the contingents began to appear. Meanwhile Warwick, though it was still Lent,¹ and the seas were rough, put forth from Calais and paid a flying visit to his uncle York. It was absolutely necessary for the heads of the exiled faction to concert a common plan of action, and so this long and dangerous voyage to Ireland had to be undertaken. Warwick reached Waterford in safety, and held a hasty conference with his uncle at Dublin; they agreed that it would be fatal to allow the royalists time to make preparations, and that a simultaneous descent on England must take place in June; the Calais force

¹ It is difficult to get the exact dates of the voyage. Warwick started soon after Ash Wednesday (February 27), and was back by Whitsunday (June 1).

was to land in Kent, while Duke Richard crossed to North Wales or Chester. The plan appeared somewhat hazardous, but all the news from England was to the effect that the government of the queen and her friends were more unpopular than ever, and Warwick had specific promises from Kent that his friends there and in London would rise in arms the moment that he came ashore. The general scheme being settled, Warwick sailed back to Calais, taking with him his mother, the Countess of Salisbury, who was anxious to rejoin her husband. Off the Cornish coast he came into contact with the royalist squadron which the Duke of Exeter had organised, consisting of four great carracks and ten other ships. But when Warwick's ten vessels offered battle, Exeter put his helm about and fled into Dartmouth harbour. After he had given orders to close with the Yorkist squadron, his officers had informed him that the crews, most of whom had served under Warwick in 1457-59, would not fight, and that they would desert to the earl if the fleets drew any nearer. Hence came the sudden retreat of the duke.

Thus Warwick sailed back to Calais unmolested, on June 1, to complete his preparations. All had gone well in his absence: Somerset was in great straits at Guisnes, and no new reinforcements had yet joined him. Shortly after the earl's return, however, a small force from Sandwich tried to cross the strait. It was scattered by a tempest, and the ship of its commander, Lord Audley, was driven into Calais, where he and his men were forced to yield themselves prisoners. In spite of his father's death at Blore Heath, this young lord turned out to be such a lukewarm royalist that he was persuaded to join the Yorkist cause, and served under the White Rose in the next campaign.

About June 20, as it would seem, Warwick struck his blow. Sir John Dynham and Sir John Wenlock crossed with his vanguard to Sandwich, and there attacked the royalist force—the wrecks of Audley's expedition and certain new levies. They were beaten out of the town, while their captain Mundeford was captured, and sent to Calais. Warwick caused him to be beheaded on June 25 after a form of trial. He had been one of the officers who had deserted with Trollope at Ludford, and Warwick professed to regard these mercenaries as traitors, for

CHAP. breaking the oath of service which they had sworn to him as
XVI. captain of Calais. This was not the first occasion on which he had taken revenge on them; several prisoners of this class had already been put to death, though all other captives had been kindly entreated. This unjustifiable practice on the part of Warwick was excused, in the eyes of his friends, by the fact that the queen had already begun to use the axe and block. In February a barrister named Roger Neville, presumably one of Warwick's poor relations, and ten other persons had been executed in London, on the charge of intending to pass over to Calais. From these acts of bloodshed, on either side, may be traced the beginning of the bitter spirit in which the war was for the future conducted.

Although the government had received fair warning that discontent was rife all over southern England—seditious “bills” were being stuck up on church doors, and seditious ballads sung at street corners¹—it had made no preparation to meet such a contingency as a serious Yorkist invasion of the south. The king and queen were as usual in the midlands; there was no force under arms in Kent, save the 500 men at Sandwich whom Dynham and Wenlock had just defeated. London, though known to be ill-disposed, had not been garrisoned. Apparently the completeness of the king's success in the campaign of Ludford had led the ministers to believe that it was unlikely that any large force would ever gather again under York's banner. That the lords and bishops who had refused to join the insurgent army in 1459 would do so in 1460 seemed to them improbable. Moreover there was, as usual, a dearth of money in the exchequer, and it would have been a costly business to keep a large force under arms all through the spring and summer, awaiting a possible invasion.

It was only when the small force that had seized Sandwich remained on shore instead of retiring to Calais, that Queen Margaret and her friends saw that the Yorkists meant serious business, and then it was too late to stop Warwick. On June 26 he landed, and joined his vanguard with 2,000 men; in his company were his father Salisbury, his uncle Fauconberg, his nephew the young Earl of March, and his new convert Audley,

¹ See the specimens in *Chron.*, ed. Davies, pp. 91-94.

besides a papal legate—Coppini, Bishop of Terni—who, sent by Pius II. to preach peace at the English court, chose strange companions for his journey. Before landing the invaders had published a manifesto, which set forth the weak governance of the realm, the loss of France, the “murder” of Humphrey of Gloucester, the exclusion of the king’s relatives from his council, and their cruel oppression by the queen’s favourites, the diversion of the revenues of the realm into the pockets of courtiers, and the leaguings of the ministers with the French and the wild Irish. Warwick was soon joined by the whole of the Kentishmen, with Archbishop Bourchier and Lord Cobham at their head. He pushed on without a moment’s hesitation, and was at the gates of London on June 30. Next day the archbishop’s herald summoned the city to surrender. Some Lancastrian lords, Hungerford, Scales, and Lovel, endeavoured to offer resistance, but the citizens drove them into the Tower, while a deputation of aldermen went forth to offer a free entry to Warwick and his host. On July 2 the archbishop and the three earls, accompanied by the legate, made a state entry into London. On the following day Warwick made an oration at St. Paul’s, where convocation was sitting, and “recited the cause of their coming into the land, how they had been put forth from the king’s presence with great violence, so that they might never come to his presence to excuse themselves of the accusations laid against them. But now they were come again, by God’s mercy, accompanied by their people, to declare their innocence or else to die upon the field. And then they made an oath upon the cross of Canterbury, that they bore true faith and liegeance to the king’s person, whereof they took God and his Mother, and all the saints of heaven to witness.”¹

The earl brought batteries to bear on the Tower from the side of St. Katharine’s wharf, and commenced a regular siege. He then called out the whole available force of the Yorkist faction. Great succours came in; the invaders were joined by the Bishops of Rochester, Salisbury, Exeter, and Ely, the Lords Bourchier, Abergavenny, and Scrope (all kinsmen of York or Warwick), Say and Clinton, with “much people out of Kent, Sussex, and Essex”. Rumour, exaggerating as usual,

¹ See *Chron.*, ed. Davies, p. 95.

CHAP. credited them with an army of 30,000 men. Leaving Salis-
XVI. bury and Cobham, with the mayor and the levies of London, to blockade the Tower, Warwick marched on Northampton, where the king's standard had been set up. He was determined that the Lancastrians should not have time to draw in to their assistance the lords of the north and west. They were, indeed, taken unawares by his approach, and had not yet mustered anything like their full force. The king had given the command to the old Duke of Buckingham, a moderate man and one respected even by the Yorkists, but no general. With him were Egremont and Beaumont, both personal enemies of the Nevilles, the Earl of Shrewsbury, and Lord Grey de Ruthyn. It was a poor muster, but of the other Lancastrians Somerset was still shut up in Guisnes, the Earls of Devon and Wiltshire were in the west, the Duke of Exeter with his fleet was also in that direction, and Scales, Hungerford, Vesey, Lovel, and Delawarr were being besieged in the Tower, while Northumberland, Clifford, and the other northern barons had not yet passed the Trent. The queen and her little son were sent away into Staffordshire on the news of the enemy's approach.

Buckingham, conscious of inferior numbers, resolved to stand on the defensive. Remembering, perhaps, the successful tactics of the French at Castillon, he had built himself an entrenched camp, and garnished its earthworks with much artillery. It lay in the meadows south of the Nen, with both flanks covered by the river, the lines being drawn from water to water. On the slopes above stood Delapré Priory, overlooking the water-meadows and the entrenchments, at a distance too great for the effective use of medieval artillery. Here Warwick halted and drew up his host; before attacking he made two separate attempts to secure an interview with the king. But Buckingham steadfastly refused to allow his emissary, Beauchamp, Bishop of Salisbury, to approach the royal presence, and would hear of no mediation. Indeed the proposed mediators, Archbishop Bourchier and the legate Coppini, were not likely to secure the confidence of any loyalist.

A torrential storm raged all the morning, a fact which was not without its effect on the battle, for though the rain filled the trench round the Lancastrian camp, and made it a formidable obstacle, it also spoilt nearly all the powder of Buckingham's

numerous artillery, so that few or no shot could be discharged when at last the Yorkists began to move. Warwick had arrayed his men in the usual three "battles": he himself conducted the centre, the young Earl of March led the "vaward," and Fauconberg the rearward corps. Before marching down the slope he caused it to be proclaimed that every man should spare the commons, and slay none but the lords and knights, with whom lay the blame of the war. The attack on the trenches had hardly begun when treachery ruined the Lancastrian cause. Lord Grey de Ruthyn, whose men held the left of the lines, mounted the badge of the "Ragged Staff," and admitted the enemy within the entrenchments; his men were seen reaching their hands down to pull the Yorkists up the slippery bank, which they could not have mounted without aid. The whole of the column commanded by the young Earl of March was thus able to penetrate into the camp, and sweeping along its front cleared the way for the other divisions to burst in. All was over in half an hour, and with very little bloodshed; less than 300 men perished, including a few who were drowned as they tried to ford the Nen. But among the list of slain were nearly all the Lancastrian leaders. Warwick's orders had been carried out; the rank and file were allowed to escape, but the victors gave no quarter to knights and nobles. Buckingham, Beaumont, Egremont, Shrewsbury, and Sir William Lucy, were all slaughtered close to the king's tent, as they strove by a last rally to gain him time to flee. But Henry, shiftless as ever, failed to get away, and was taken prisoner. His capture gave the Yorkists the same advantage that they had enjoyed after the battle of St. Albans; with the king in their hands they could assume the pose of loyal subjects, nominate a new ministry, and throw the odium of disloyalty upon their opponents. Warwick asked for nothing more, but there were others in the party whose views had developed since 1455, and who thought that the time had come to raise the dynastic question. While the queen and her son were still at large, and the lords of the north were still under arms, the possession of the king's person meant much, but not everything.

Meanwhile Warwick had the fate of the realm in his hands, for York, who ought to have landed at Chester in time to support the invasion of Kent, did not present himself till September

CHAP. had come. The earl therefore made, on his own responsibility,
XVI. all the necessary arrangements for the governance of the realm. On July 16 the king was conducted in state to London, and nine days later it was announced that he had appointed George Neville, Warwick's younger brother, the Bishop of Exeter, as his chancellor, and Lord Bouchier as his treasurer. Salisbury was made lieutenant for the six northern counties, which still remained to be subdued; John Neville, his second son, became the king's chamberlain, and William Bouchier constable of the Tower. The Lancastrian garrison in that fortress had surrendered upon the 18th, more because of the news from Northampton than because of the lack of provisions, which was made the formal reason for capitulating. All the garrison was dismissed in safety, save certain squires who had served under Warwick when he was "keeping the seas," and had passed over from him to his successor Exeter. The earl, following the precedent that he had set in the case of Mundeford, caused them to be tried at the Guildhall and beheaded for breaking their oath to him. For this abuse of power he must bear the blame; but he was not responsible for the death of Lord Scales, who passing from the Tower to Westminster to take sanctuary, was set upon and slain by a mob of London watermen.

In August the earl crossed to Calais, to make an end of Somerset, whose position at Guisnes was now forlorn and hopeless. The duke offered to capitulate as soon as he heard of the earl's arrival. But instead of acknowledging the new government, as he had promised, he retired into France, and from thence rejoined Queen Margaret.

This matter having been settled, the Yorkists ought to have marched without delay into the lands beyond the Humber, to crush the partisans of Lancaster, and to check the incursions of the Scots. For the young King James II., without professing himself the ally of either Henry VI. or the Duke of York, had levied an army in July, and laid siege to Roxburgh Castle, the last remaining fragment of the old Scottish conquests of Edward III. He was killed by the explosion of one of his own hooped cannon, while watching the bombardment on August 3. But his lords continued the leaguer and Roxburgh had to surrender on the 8th. The Scots army passed on to Wark, captured it, and then dispersed. Apparently the Yorkist leaders

thought that the chastisement of the Scots might be postponed, and that the discontent of the north would lead to no further trouble. At any rate they committed in 1460 precisely the same error that their enemies had committed in 1459. Instead of stamping out the smouldering embers of rebellion, they wasted precious weeks in legalising their position by parliamentary proceedings, when it could only be made safe with the sword.

Richard of York had landed in Lancashire on September 2: he did not turn aside to put down the troubles in the north, but made a leisurely progress toward London, where parliament was summoned to meet on October 7. On his way he held great sessions and administered justice under a royal commission at Ludlow, Hereford, Shrewsbury, Coventry, and other places. When he reached Abingdon "he sent for trumpeters and claryners out of London, and gave them banners with the royal arms of England, blazoned without any diversity, and commanded his sword of state to be borne upright before him, and so rode till he came to the gates of the palace of Westminster".¹ This deliberate assumption of royal state was the beginning of evils. Duke Richard saw that in 1459 he had been ruined by the use of the king's name against him, and fondly hoped that by taking that name to himself he could prevent any recurrence of the disaster of Ludford. The south had now declared for the cause of York in such an unmistakable fashion that the duke imagined that it would follow him to any length. He was deceived; the victory had been Warwick's, not his own; and Warwick was convinced, and rightly as it appeared, that the people wanted a change of ministry and not a change of dynasty.

Parliament had already met two days before Duke Richard arrived at Westminster. It had been opened by King Henry in person, and had started its work by repealing all the acts of the parliament of Coventry, and annulling the attainders of the Yorkist lords. The houses were actually sitting when Richard entered the hall. Approaching the vacant throne he laid his hand on the cushion, as if about to take formal possession of the seat. A dead silence followed, till Archbishop Bourchier asked him if he wished to go in to see the king,

¹ Gregory, p. 208.

CHAP. and what he desired to do. The duke replied in set terms
XVI. that as to going to see the king, "there was no one in the realm who ought not to come to see me, rather than that I should go to see him," and "challenged and claimed the realm and crown of England, as heir of King Richard II., proposing without any delay to be crowned on All Hallows Day then following" (November 1).¹ The lords stood aghast, and York ended the scene by retiring with his retinue to the royal apartments, whose doors he broke open by force, and there installed himself.

There followed a fortnight of busy and bitter negotiation between Duke Richard and his own followers, hardly one of whom, from Warwick and Archbishop Bourchier downward, showed the least liking for the change of dynasty. It was in vain that Richard laid his claim before the lords, exhibiting his pedigree back to Lionel of Clarence, and demonstrating the weakness of the Lancastrian title as it had been set forth by Henry IV. at the moment of his coronation. The peers first referred the document to the judges, who sent it back, saying that such matters were too high for them, and then drew up objections to it themselves. They had sworn allegiance to the present king; his title, however doubtful by descent, was clear by the acts of parliament of 1399, and it was a question whether the first Lancastrian act of 1407, which entailed the crown upon heirs male instead of upon heirs general, had not ruled out any claims through Philippa of Clarence. In fact Richard's demands to be recognised as king involved the repudiation of the right of the parliament of England to determine the succession, and the adoption of a purely legitimist theory, to the effect that the crown could not be alienated from the natural heir by any act of the nation. It was in vain that the duke drew up a reply to these objections; his most faithful friends, including his nephew Warwick, begged him not to press a claim which would estrange from him three-fourths of his supporters. At last he yielded, and on October 25 consented to a compromise, by which Henry VI. was to wear the crown for the rest of his life, while he himself was to be invested with the

¹ Whethamsted, i., 377; William of Worcester, p. 774; *Engl. Chron.*, ed. Gairdner, p. 75.

principality of Wales, and recognised as heir to the throne. Nothing was said of Prince Edward: it is curious that the Yorkists did not bring forward their old statement that he was no true son of the king. The fact that this obvious device was not tried, seems to prove that York and his responsible advisers had no belief in the story. But it is also possible that they omitted this plea because King Henry's assent to the compromise had to be secured, and even that mildest of monarchs would have refused to disown his own child.

On October 31 the king formally gave his consent to the agreement "for the eschewing of the further effusion of Christian blood". An act of parliament ratified the bargain, and another repealed the statute of 1407 which confined the succession to male heirs. York with his sons did homage to the king, and then the two houses did homage to him as heir to the throne. A week later he proclaimed himself protector, a step by which he seems to have gone beyond the settlement of October 25, yet not unnatural, for he had already thrice exercised the office in his unhappy cousin's name. But in 1460 the sword and not acts of parliament was the ultimate ruling force in England, and while York had been passing statutes Queen Margaret had been collecting a new army. She had escaped many dangers by the way, after the battle of Northampton, and finally found refuge with her brother-in-law, the Earl of Pembroke, at Harlech Castle. Thither she began to summon her adherents for a new effort. The Duke of Exeter was the first to join her; Somerset and Devon came up soon after from the south, with such followers as they could collect. But the strength of the party lay in the north, where the Earl of Northumberland and the Lords Roos, Clifford, Neville, Dacre, and Greystock had mustered a large force at York. Margaret handed over the charge of Wales to Jasper of Pembroke and the Earl of Wiltshire, and hastened into Yorkshire, where she conferred with the northern lords, and then went off to Dumfries to conclude a treaty of alliance with the Scottish regency.

On hearing of the musters beyond the Humber, Duke Richard marched northward to quell the rising. Undervaluing its importance he took with him a small force—only 3,000 men it is said—but in his company went his brother-in-law, Salisbury, his second son, Edmund Earl of Rutland, several

CHAP. of the younger Nevilles and Bouchiers, and a contingent of
XVI. Londoners, under one Harrow, a mercer, the most energetic partisan of York in the city. At the same time the young Earl of March was sent to the Welsh border with a still smaller force, to deal with Pembroke and James of Wiltshire. York met the vanguard of the Northumbrians, under the Duke of Somerset, near Worksop, and suffered some loss in a skirmish with them. But he pushed on nevertheless as far as his own castle of Sandal, by Wakefield, where he kept his last Christmas. Five days later he was beset by the enemy in overwhelming force. The details of the fight are lost; according to one chronicle the queen's army surprised York's camp while many of his men were out foraging;¹ according to another they fell upon him late in the afternoon, when he was not expecting an attack.² A third alleges that the two parties had concluded an armistice, and that the Lancastrians broke it and assailed an unprepared enemy.³ This much only is certain, that Richard of York was slain in plain battle before the gates of Sandal Castle on December 30, 1460, and that there fell with him not only all his chief captains but the greater part of his host. For the northern men, unlike the Yorkists at Northampton, gave no quarter to great or small. With Richard fell Lord Harrington, Thomas Neville, second son of Salisbury, Sir Edward Bouchier, Sir Thomas Parr, Sir Thomas Harrington, Sir James Pickering, Harrow, the captain of the Londoners, with many other knights and squires and, as it was said, 2,500 of their men. The Earl of Rutland, "the best disposed young lord in the land," aged only seventeen, was slain on Wakefield bridge by Lord Clifford, to whom he had yielded himself in the pursuit. The old Earl of Salisbury was taken alive, led to the Lancastrian head-quarters at Pontefract, and there beheaded next day by the Bastard of Exeter. The heads of Duke Richard and Rutland were also smitten off, and set, along with that of Salisbury, over the south gate of York; the duke's head was adorned, in derision, with a crown of gold paper.

This mishandling of the dead, and reckless slaughter of the

¹ William of Worcester, p. 75.

² *Latin Chronicle*, ed. Gairdner, p. 171.

³ Whethamsted, i., 382.

common folk, marks one more downward step in the character of the civil war. But there was worse to come : the executions that had begun with those of Roger Neville and Osbern Mundeford were soon to become habitual ; each side had to revenge not merely its chiefs who had fallen in battle, but its chiefs who had perished on the scaffold. The remnants of pity and good feeling which still endured after St. Albans and Northampton now disappear, and the war becomes a chronicle of atrocities. Richard of York, with all his faults, was a far more scrupulous personage than his successor, Edward of March ; indeed he had so often been tricked and flouted that we can almost excuse his desperate grasp at the crown in October, 1460. The same deterioration may be noted in the Lancastrians : Queen Margaret's stern and bitter character grew far more ruthless after the disinheritance of her son ; and there were no longer about her men like the old Duke of Buckingham, who still preserved some trace of moderation and patriotism, but only young lords who had the deaths of their fathers to revenge, like the second Somerset and Northumberland, Clifford and Shrewsbury. The war which had begun as a struggle to vindicate constitutional liberties, degenerated after 1460 into a mere blood-feud between two reckless factions.

CHAPTER XVII.

FROM WAKEFIELD TO HEXHAM.—THE ASCENDENCY OF THE EARL OF WARWICK.

CHAP. ON the deaths of Duke Richard and his brother-in-law Salis-
XVII. bury the conduct of the Yorkist party fell into the hands of the younger Neville earl, Richard of Warwick, a man of such mark that the other magnates of the faction, Norfolk, the two Bourchiers, and the rest, were content to follow his lead. He was not only a great fighter by land and sea, but a statesman, a diplomatist and an orator. "He ever had the good voice of the people, because he knew how to give them fair words, showing himself easy and familiar with them, for he was very subtle at gaining his ends, and always spoke not of himself but of the augmentation and good governance of the kingdom, for which he would spend his life; and thus he had the goodwill of England, so that in all the land he was the lord who was held in most esteem and faith and credence." Though he was now the greatest of English land-owners, joining by his father's death the broad estates of Neville and Montagu to those of Beauchamp and Despenser, and though he maintained a small army of "household men" from his own resources, it was not so much as "the last of the barons" that he was formidable, but as the recognised leader of the constitutional opposition which traced back its pedigree to Humphrey of Gloucester. He had strengthened his position of late by opposing his uncle's plans for the deposition of Henry VI., demonstrating thereby, as men thought, that he cared more for the welfare of the realm than for the personal ambitions of York.

Warwick was a good soldier, but no great general; in statecraft he was ready and plausible rather than far-sighted. As a man he was liberal and courteous, a good master and a

firm friend, but slow to pardon those who had wronged or betrayed him. Up to this moment his record as an honest and disinterested magnate, who had not forgotten that he was an Englishman as well as a Yorkist, was unimpeachable. A time came when he showed, under great temptation and provocation, that there was a limit to his loyalty, and that injured personal pride might drive him into unworthy paths; but in 1460 he was the most dignified and respectable as well as the most powerful personality in England. There was no rival for him in the ranks of the Yorkist party. His young cousin Edward of March, to whom Duke Richard's inheritance had just passed, was at this time known only as a handsome and promising lad of nineteen, who had displayed great personal courage at the battle of Northampton. That he was not likely to prove a negligible quantity in politics was evident, but no one could have foreseen the strange mixture of strong and weak qualities which were to develop into the complex character of Edward IV.

The news of the disaster of Wakefield reached London about January 5, 1461. Warwick was absent, keeping his new year's feast in his castle by the Avon; the Earl of March was at Shrewsbury watching the Welsh Lancastrians. On receiving the ill news the elder earl hurried back to London, but the younger remained in the marches, leaving the responsibility of providing for the defence of the capital against the queen's army to his cousin. There was a great muster of the surviving Yorkist magnates to support Warwick, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Arundel, the lords Bouchier, Bonville, Cobham, Fitzwalter, Delawarr, and many more, came up with large contingents, and London and Kent sent out their levies with enthusiasm. The news of the bad behaviour of the queen's northern troops did more than anything else to strengthen the aversion of the men of the home counties for the cause of Lancaster. On their way the invaders sacked the towns of Grantham, Stamford, Peterborough, Huntingdon, Royston, and Melbourne, as they passed down the Ermine Street. They robbed even the beggars, and stole the holy vessels from the altar. "In this country," wrote a partisan of York to his kinsman on January 23, "every man is well willing to go with my lords here, and I hope God shall help them, for the people in

CHAP. the North rob and steal, and are appointed to pillage all this
XVII. country, and give away men's goods and livelihood in all the South country."¹

The queen, with Somerset, Exeter, Northumberland, Clifford and all the other northern lords, reached Dunstable on February 16 and drove out from it a small Yorkist force—the first enemies that they had seen since Wakefield. On the following day they found Warwick and all his allies ranged across their path, in a carefully selected position, where they had been busy entrenching themselves for some days. "They had pitched a field, and fortified it full strong," with its left resting on the town of St. Albans and its right on the heath called No-Man's-Land. The front was composed of a line of hedges, and was strengthened with rope-entanglements, palisades, and caltrops. Cannon had been laid to command the main approaches, and, for the first time in English military history, there were also smaller firearms in the field, Warwick having a body of Burgundian hand-gun-men in his service.

The outpost duties of the Yorkist army were badly performed; "the prickners came not home to bring tidings how near the queen was, save one, who said that she was yet nine miles off". Warwick's men were taken practically by surprise when the Lancastrians suddenly attacked him, not in front but on his left flank, in St. Albans town. Their first rush was beaten off by a body of archers placed at the High Cross in the market place. But a second attack, made by way of St. Peter's Lane, at the north end of the town, was successful and broke through the Yorkist line. Warwick and his colleagues then attempted to wheel back their left-centre and form a new front; "like unwise men they brake their array and field, and would take another, and or ever they were busked to battle the queen's party was at hand-strokes with them".² The fighting ground was cut up into small crofts and gardens divided by hedges, and the new line was never properly formed. It is said that treachery also was on foot among some of the Yorkist contingents. This at least is certain, that their army broke up, though a great part of it never even got into the fighting line. The slaughter does not seem to have been very great, but the

¹ *Paston Letters*, iii., 250.

² Most of these details are from Gregory, p. 213.

whole force was shattered, and Warwick led off no more than a wreck from the field. King Henry, who had been taken out to the battle by the Yorkists, fell into the hands of his friends, and was brought in triumph to meet his wife. But this happy accident did not soften the queen's heart; on the next morning she ordered the execution of the chief prisoners taken—the old Lord Bonville, whose heir had fallen eight weeks before at Wakefield, Sir Thomas Kyriel, and William Gower, who had carried the royal banner. She brought them before her little seven-year-old son, and made the boy pass sentence of death upon them; “the prince was judge his own self,” as a disgusted chronicler remarks.¹ While Kyriel was being led away to the block, he is said to have invoked God's vengeance on one who could teach a child such words. The curse came home at Tewkesbury.

The battle was fought on February 17, and the queen might have been before the gates of London next morning. It is certain that they would have been opened to her, for there was no Yorkist garrison within; Warwick had been driven westward, while Neville the chancellor, Archbishop Bourchier, and the other magnates left in the city, had fled to Canterbury. The mayor and corporation would not have shown fight when abandoned by their political chiefs; indeed, no town in England during the Wars of the Roses ever attempted to defend itself against a victorious army. But King Henry refused to allow his adherents to march straight upon London. He had seen with horror the town of St. Albans sacked under his eyes, and had heard of the other outrages practised by the northern men during their advance. Wishing to spare London from pillage, he prevailed upon his wife and his lords to send envoys to demand its surrender, and to keep back the army. The Londoners had no objection to capitulating, but were anxious to get good terms. On the 20th they sent the Dowager Duchesses of Bedford and Buckingham, with certain aldermen, to intercede for them with the queen. Thus negotiations were opened, which dragged on for six days. On the 26th all was settled, and the city sent out to the Lancastrians a large sum of money, and prepared a long train of waggons laden with

¹ Gregory, p. 212.

CHAP. "Lenten stuff" to feed them. But a mob stopped and plundered
XVII. the wains at Newgate. This outburst angered the queen, and that night she sent a force under Sir Baldwin Fulford to seize Westminster and overawe the city. It was too late; on the morning of the 27th the Londoners heard, to their joy, that a Yorkist army was near at hand, and a few hours later Warwick and the Earl of March arrived and entered the capital with a force of 6,000 or 7,000 men. Fulford abandoned Westminster, and fled to join the main Lancastrian host without offering resistance.

The movements of the Yorkist chiefs require a word of explanation; Warwick, after his defeat, had resolved to fall back on his cousin and the army of the west. He reached Burford in Oxfordshire¹ on February 22nd, where he met Edward of March hastening to join him. The young earl had just brought to a victorious end the first campaign which he conducted on his own responsibility. He had received the news of Wakefield as he lay at Shrewsbury, and was soon afterwards beset by the Lancastrians of Wales, under Wiltshire, Pembroke, and Pembroke's father, Owen Tudor. After some preliminary manœuvring, he brought them to action at Mortimer's Cross near Wigmore on February 2. The details of this engagement are lost; we only know that a portent of three suns visible simultaneously—some strange atmospheric refraction—was seen on the battle morning, and taken as a good omen by the Yorkists.² The victory of Edward was complete, and he celebrated it in the evil fashion now prevalent, by executing his chief captives, Owen Tudor, Sir John Throckmorton, and six other knights. "And when Owen was beheaded and his head set on the steps of the market-cross at Hereford, a mad woman combed his hair, and washed away the blood off his face, and got candles and set them around the head all burning, more than a hundred." Jasper Tudor, more fortunate than his father, escaped, and with him Wiltshire, who led off the wreck of his forces to join the queen. Having cleared his rear by this victory, Edward had set out to join Warwick, but was too late for the fight of St. Albans, and only met his cousin five days after it had been lost. They must have been kept well informed of

¹ So Gregory, but William of Worcester says that Chipping-Norton was the junction place.

² Gregory, p. 211; *Chron.*, ed. Gairdner, p. 77.

the situation at London day by day, or they would not dared to throw themselves into the city at this moment. It seems almost certain that the corporation must have prolonged the negotiations with Queen Margaret because they were aware that the two earls were marching to their aid.

When London was safe, the Yorkist leaders took the decisive step which they had refused to countenance three months before. Feeling had been so much embittered by the executions after Wakefield and St. Albans, that all scruples as to old allegiance were thrown aside. Warwick had lost a father and a brother, the Bouchiers a nephew and son, every other family some relative more or less near. Public opinion in the south had been so outraged by the reckless plundering of the queen's army, that the cause of Lancaster was hateful as it had never been before. Moreover King Henry was no longer in their hands, and it was impossible to use his name to cover their acts, as they had been doing since the day of Northampton. Accordingly on Sunday, February 28, the morning after the entry of the army into London, the chancellor George Neville harangued the troops and citizens in Clerkenwell fields, set forth the claims of the Earl of March to the throne, and called upon them to recognise him as King Edward IV. His speech was received with enthusiasm. On March 3 a deputation, consisting of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Norfolk, the Bishops of Salisbury and Exeter, the Earl of Warwick, and the lords Fitzwalter and Ferrers of Chartley, with certain knights and citizens of London, called upon the Earl of March at his lodging in Baynard's Castle and besought him to take up the crown that was his right. Edward was graciously pleased to assent to their request, and next morning they all rode in state to Westminster, where he was enthroned, sat beneath a canopy with the crown on his head and the sceptre of Edward the Confessor in his hand, and received the homage of all the magnates present.

The proceedings took a strictly legitimist form, as was indeed necessary. There was no form of election, but Edward was recognised as *de jure* king by reason of his descent from Lionel of Clarence. The theory set forth by the Yorkists was that he and his ancestors had been the true possessors of the crown since the death of Richard II., and that no parliamentary

CHAP. proceedings, such as those of 1399, had any power to alienate
XVII. the right of succession from the elder line.

The Lancastrians were no farther off than Barnet, Dunstable, and St. Albans on the day that Edward entered London. But the northern army was in a condition of such discontent and disarray that the queen dared not lead it forward. The lords were angry with the king for the scruples which had lost him the fruits of their victory. The common soldiery, still more angry at having been cheated of the plunder of the capital, were melting away in thousands. So small and so unsteady in spirit was the body which still lingered around the royal standard, that the queen and Somerset agreed that it would be useless to attack London, and dangerous to await the advance of the Yorkists. They turned northward, and retired, ravaging the country about them as they went.

King Edward and Warwick remained in London for a week after the ceremony at Westminster, in order to gather in all the forces that could be mustered from Kent, Essex, and East Anglia. On the 10th, however, Warwick marched out with the vaward; on the 12th the king followed with the rest of the army. On the 26th they were in touch with the enemy, who was in force behind the line of the Aire, prepared to cover York. On hearing that the Yorkists were in pursuit, Queen Margaret had issued an appeal to the northern barons to re-assemble their levies, and the Lancastrian army was now stronger than ever. Every magnate of the party was present—the Dukes of Exeter and Somerset, the Earls of Northumberland, Devon, Shrewsbury and Wiltshire, the Lords Roos, Clifford, Neville, Beaumont, Welles, Willoughby, Scales, Moleyns, Mauley, Ferrers of Groby, Hungerford, Lovel, Dacre, and Grey of Rougemont. The force under their command must have been very large: the chroniclers, in their habitual exaggeration, speak of 60,000 or 100,000 men. Perhaps so many as 15,000 or 20,000 may have been present. The Yorkists were decidedly inferior in numbers. It would appear that there were present with King Edward the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Warwick, and the Lords Bouchier, Fauconberg, Stanley, Fitzwalter, Scrope of Bolton, Berners, Clinton, Grey of Ruthyn, and Montagu.¹

¹ Warwick's younger brother, John Neville, must have been given this title before Towton, see *Paston Letters*, iii., 267.

The Lancastrians lay encamped at Towton and Tadcaster, beside the high road from Doncaster to York; the Aire, swollen with spring rains, was in their front, and an advanced guard under Lord Clifford held its chief passage at Ferrybridge, where the old Roman road crosses the river. This force was dislodged on March 28 by the Yorkist van, after a fierce skirmish in which Lord Clifford on the one side and Lord Fitzwalter on the other were slain. All that afternoon and next morning Edward's army was defiling across the Aire, and taking up its position on the low rising ground beside the village of Saxton. Opposite them, on the other side of a slight valley called Dintingdale, the enemy was visible, arrayed on a hillside which extends from the high road to York on the east to the little river Cock on the west. It is a well-marked position, a little more than a mile in length, with a gentle slope in front, well fitted for the effective use of archery. The Cock, then in flood, gave perfect cover to the right wing; but the left had no flank protection, and could be easily turned by troops moving in the low ground beyond the high road. This defect in the position was all the more dangerous because the main line of retreat for the Lancastrian army, the country road from Saxton to Towton, could easily be intercepted from this quarter. The Yorkists also were on very perilous ground, for the Aire, passable only at two points, lay but a few miles behind their line. It would seem that in the Lancastrian line Somerset and Exeter led the right wing, Northumberland (whose vassals must have formed the largest individual contingent present) the main battle, Devon and Lord Dacre the left. Of the Yorkists, Fauconberg had command on the left wing, the centre was in charge of Warwick and the king, the right was committed to the Duke of Norfolk. But it seems that this part of the host was not fully on the field till late in the day, for Norfolk is spoken of as coming into action some time after the battle had begun.

King Edward, however, took the offensive, even though his army was not yet fully arrived. The Yorkists crossed Dintingdale, and began to climb the opposite slope, in the midst of a blinding snowstorm, which beat along the Lancastrian line so as to render its archery to a great degree useless. The fighting became hand to hand all along the front, and had many vicissitudes; at one time part of the Yorkist left wing was

CHAP.
XVII.

driven off the heights, and some of the men fled to Ferry-bridge, plundering the king's baggage on the way.¹ The Lancastrians are said to have lost their order by breaking down the hillside in pursuit of these fugitives, and never to have been able to recover it. Warwick had made a solid lodgment in their centre, and held his own on the heights, till the Duke of Norfolk came up with his fresh troops on the extreme eastern end of the field. Probably this force turned the Lancastrian's left by way of the plain, and fell upon their flank. It is at any rate certain that, when they at last begun to give way, a great part of their host found its retreat cut off on the Saxton-Towton road, and had no way of escaping, save by fording the swollen Cock. Apparently the whole right wing was driven into the river; many—including Somerset their leader—got across where the water ran shallow, but many more were drowned or slain as they struggled in the deeper places, and others were made prisoners, thereby escaping death only for a few hours. For the king was not contented with the fearful slaughter that had taken place among the hostile leaders, though Northumberland, Neville, Dacre, Mauley, and Welles had fallen, along with Sir Henry Stafford, son of the late Duke of Buckingham, Sir Andrew Trollope (the deserter of Ludford), Sir Ralph Grey and many other captains. He ordered all the prisoners of rank to be beheaded; thus perished the Earl of Devon, the Bastard of Exeter, and no less than forty-two knights of the north country. The loss of the victors does not seem to have been very great; but Warwick was wounded, as was Lord Scrope; only Sir John Stafford and Robert Horne, captain of the men of Kent, are recorded as slain in King Edward's ranks.²

King Henry and Queen Margaret fled from York towards Scotland on the evening of the battle. Next morning the victors occupied the city; Edward's first act was to take down

¹ *Chron.*, ed. Gairdner, p. 173, *cf.* Wavrin, v., 340, where the author seems for once to be giving genuine details.

² The story of Towton has to be patched together from Whethamsted, Gregory, Hearne's fragment, and *Chron.*, ed. Gairdner; I have passed over Hall's narrative, which is demonstrably wrong in many points. He says, *e.g.*, that Norfolk was not present, which is disproved by the two last-named authorities,

the heads of his father, brother, and uncle from the gate, and to replace them by those of the Earl of Devon and the Bastard of Exeter. He abode in York for some weeks, settling the affairs of the north; the whole country seemed at his mercy, and there was no resistance; even the castles of the Percies were surrendered.¹ In April he made a tour to Durham and Newcastle; at the latter place he beheaded the Earl of Wiltshire, who had been caught lurking at Cockermouth, on his way to take refuge in Scotland. The object of this advance was to drive out of England Henry and his queen, who still lingered just inside the Border, hoping for aid from the Scots. They had bought it by handing over Berwick to the Regents Kennedy and Boyd, and offering to cede Carlisle also. But on the approach of Edward and his army they had to retire to Edinburgh, for the Scots would not give battle to the victor of Towton, and adopted their usual defensive policy.

Finding that there was no prospect of a serious Scottish invasion, Edward turned back, handing over the charge of the border and the north to Warwick and his brother Montagu. After a long tour through the midlands, he returned to the capital, and had himself crowned at Westminster in great state upon June 28. After his coronation he distributed a shower of titles among his followers, and divided among them the offices and many of the lands of the Lancastrians who had fallen at Towton. His brothers, George and Richard, aged twelve and eight respectively, were made Dukes of Clarence and Gloucester. His uncle by marriage, Lord Bouchier, became Earl of Essex, and Fauconberg, Earl of Kent. Seven others of his chief supporters were created barons—Sir William Hastings, Sir William Herbert, Sir Humphrey Stafford, Sir John Wenlock, Sir Robert Ogle, Sir Thomas Lumley, and Sir Humphrey Bouchier.² Warwick was not raised to a dukedom, as some had hoped and expected,³ but rewarded with a number of high offices, becoming grand chamberlain of England, steward of the duchy of Lan-

¹ See Cadwallader Bates' *Northumbrian Border Holds*, Appendix L, for proof that Dunstanburgh and others were surrendered.

² All took their own names as their titles save Bouchier, who was made Lord Cromwell, having married the heiress of the last holder of that title, long treasurer under Henry VI.

³ "Utinam duke!" says Friar Brackley in the *Paston Letters*, iii., 243.

CHAP. caster, warden of the Cinque Ports, and warden both of the
XVII. East and West Marches of Scotland. It was not till four months later that the king assembled his first parliament, on November 4, 1461, so that he reigned in all eight months without receiving any parliamentary title. Meanwhile affairs had not been quiet on the northern border. The Scots made a vain attempt to seize Carlisle, and King Henry's English followers made a daring raid beyond the Tyne in June, advancing as far as Brancepeth in the palatinate of Durham. Warwick was unable to attend the coronation; indeed he could not leave the north till shortly before the meeting of parliament. At any moment the Scots might make a serious attack; only when winter drew near could he leave them unwatched.

The Yorkist parliament of November 4, 1461, had the same invidious character as the Lancastrian parliament of October, 1459. The greater part of its session was devoted to the task of attainting live and dead followers of Henry VI., and providing for the confiscation of their lands and possessions. The Commons presented an address and two petitions, in which they recognised the new king as their lawful hereditary monarch, stigmatised "Henry Earl of Derby" (Henry IV.), his son and grandson, as usurpers, and prayed that all alienations of royal property since 1399 might be declared invalid. But they expressed their hope that the judicial decisions of the last sixty years, so far as they were not concerned with politics, might be allowed to stand. The king was pleased to grant these petitions, and wisely added a confirmation of all charters, pardons, grants of office, and patents made by the three usurpers, save such as had been given to the persons included in the long attainder list of this session. The act of attainder was not drawn up by the Commons but presented to them ready made. It contained the names of some 133 persons, headed by those of Henry VI., Queen Margaret, and Edward "called Prince of Wales". The unfortunate Henry, besides being condemned as a usurper, was charged with having broken the convention of November, 1460, and raised war against his lawful king, also with having, along with the queen, handed over Berwick to the Scots, the common enemies of the realm. He was therefore not only attainted of high treason, but sentenced to be deprived of his patrimony the duchy of Lancaster, which was declared to

be annexed for ever to the crown. Fourteen peers appeared in the list, seven living—Exeter, Somerset, Pembroke, Beaumont, Roos, Grey of Rougemont, and Hungerford; seven dead—Northumberland, Devon, Neville, Clifford, Welles, Dacre, and Wiltshire. The names of the latter were added in order to secure the confiscation of their estates, which would otherwise have passed to their heirs. These were all Lancastrians of 1460-61—the men of Wakefield and Towton. No attempt was made to go farther back, and to confiscate the properties of those who, like Buckingham or Shrewsbury, had fallen in the struggle before the convention of November, 1460, in the service of a *de facto* king. Then followed a list of more than a hundred knights, squires, clerks, and household retainers of Henry VI. It was a proscription far more sweeping than that which the Lancastrians had published at Coventry in 1459. Another act undid the old attainders of the reigns of Henry IV. and Henry V., and rehabilitated the memories of the lords who had fallen at Cirencester in 1400 in the cause of Richard II., and of Richard of Cambridge and his partisans, who had been executed at Southampton in 1415. All opposition to Lancaster was identified with loyalty to the rightful heirs of Edward III. On December 21 the houses were prorogued by the king in person, who promised to be “as good and gracious a sovereign lord to them as any of his noble progenitors; he would always be ready for their defence, never sparing nor letting for any jeopardy”.

For the next three years it may be said, with no great exaggeration of the facts, that Edward IV. reigned, but the Earl of Warwick ruled in England. Till the day of his marriage in 1464 the young king was completely under his cousin's influence. This was but natural; it was Warwick who had saved him from the rout of Ludford, brought him back in triumph to England, taught him his first lesson in soldiering at Northampton, and set him on the throne after Wakefield. If ever one man made another, Richard Neville had made Edward Plantagenet. The young king, moreover, was prone to permit others to do his work for him. When fighting was not afoot he was inordinately idle. He had all the softer vices of self-indulgence, and after two continuous years spent in harness was yearning for pleasure and enjoyment. After his coronation he bore himself

CHAP.
XVII.

with the thriftless good humour of a spendthrift heir who has just inherited a great fortune. He plunged into a series of banquets, jousts, state progresses, and pageants, with all the zest of his twenty years. No one as yet suspected that he possessed the brains of a statesman, the cajoling powers of a demagogue, and the cool, ruthless cruelty of an Italian tyrant. He was commonly supposed to be a typical fighting man, the slave of wine and women whenever there was no campaign in progress.

In the winter of 1461-62 there was a general hope in England that the civil war was at an end; in the whole realm only the single castle of Harlech was still held for King Henry. As to the Scots, they were so faction-ridden that their efforts were little feared. But the optimists failed to reckon with the indomitable spirit of Queen Margaret, who kept the war afoot for three years after her cause had become hopeless, by her mere personal energy. In spite of the surrender of Berwick she had found that the Scottish government gave her a very wavering support, and saw that she must look elsewhere for effective allies; she had sent first the Duke of Somerset and later the judge, Sir John Fortescue, to appeal for aid in France, where Charles VII. was just dead and the astute Louis XI. was now in power. On her hopes from this quarter was built an unsubstantial scheme in which a Scottish raid, a rising in Wales, a French landing at Sandwich, and a sudden outbreak of her English partisans were to be combined. The only tangible result of this elaborate plot was the death of the Earl of Oxford, who was to have headed the rising in the south. He was detected in correspondence with the queen, though high in favour with Edward IV. at the moment, and promptly beheaded, in company with his son, Aubrey de Vere, and three knights on February 26, 1462. It was an evil precedent that Oxford was condemned, not after a proper trial before his peers, but by the summary jurisdiction of the lord constable's court. This was the first of many executions carried out by the new constable, John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, whose ready ferocity won him the evil nickname of "the great butcher of England".

In April Queen Margaret, discontented with the progress made by her ambassadors in France, sailed herself from Kirkcudbright to Brittany with her young son, leaving her husband

behind in Scotland. She met King Louis at Chinon, and succeeded in persuading him to give her active assistance. She mortgaged Calais to him for 20,000 gold livres, and also obtained leave to make levies in Normandy and to impress ships in the Channel ports. As commander of the expedition Louis designated Pierre de Brézé, seneschal of Normandy. He was preparing to attack Calais in person, when he was scared from his design by the old Duke of Burgundy, who had been enlisted in the cause of York. Louis then bade Margaret and De Brézé sail at once, and opened negotiations with Burgundy and the English king. The queen and her champion were forced to set out with no more than 800 mercenary lances. Meanwhile she had bidden the English exiles in Scotland to invade Northumberland. In July they are found in possession of Alnwick and Naworth,¹ but both were recovered soon after by the Lords Montagu and Hastings, the lieutenants of Warwick. In October a second rising took place, and Sir Richard Tunstall seized by treachery Bamborough, the strongest of all the Northumbrian castles. This, however, was the only place in Lancastrian hands when, on the 25th, Margaret and her little expedition appeared. She had hoped that her arrival would have been followed by a general insurrection of the northern counties, but though Dunstanburgh opened its gates to her, and Alnwick fell after a few days' siege, there was no stir in any other region of the north. She was however joined by the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Pembroke, and the Lords Roos and Hungerford, while Sir Ralph Percy, the acting head of the Percies during the minority of the young Earl of Northumberland, threw off his allegiance to King Edward² and joined them, with many of the retainers of his house.

The news of the queen's landing soon brought Warwick upon the scene, and the king set out from London with his train of artillery in aid of the earl; but he fell sick of the

¹ It is not absolutely certain whether Alnwick had been in possession of the Lancastrians ever since Towton, or whether it was now captured by Sir William Tailboys. The latter seems the more likely, see Bates, *Northumbrian Border Holds*.

² He had submitted after Towton, and had been made Governor of Dunstanburgh by King Edward.

CHAP. measles on the way, and never reached the front, so that the
XVII. whole conduct of operations remained in Warwick's hands. He stationed his headquarters at Warkworth, and from thence supervised the simultaneous sieges of the three castles of Bamborough, Alnwick and Dunstanburgh. The queen with De Brézé and the French mercenaries embarked for Scotland intending there to raise an army of succour. But a tempest smote upon her flotilla as she was passing Holy Island; her own vessel was sunk, and she had to escape in an open boat to Berwick. Several more ships were cast ashore on the island, and 400 of De Brézé's men with his lieutenant, the *Sieur de Graville*, were there made prisoners by the Yorkists. Both Bamborough and Dunstanburgh capitulated at Christmastide, Somerset and Ralph Percy agreeing to do homage to King Edward, on condition that their attainders were reversed and their estates restored. Alnwick held out till January 6, 1463, when it was relieved for a moment by a Scottish force under the Earl of Angus and De Brézé. Lord Hungerford then evacuated the castle and retired to Scotland with the garrison, so that the Yorkists were able to occupy it next day.

Not one stronghold in the realm save Harlech was now held by King Henry's partisans. Warwick returned to London to sit in parliament, leaving, as usual, his brother Montagu in charge of the Scottish marches during his absence. But Margaret showed indomitable energy; not only did she succeed in dissuading the Scots from concluding peace, but she organised one more expedition for the invasion of Northumberland. Her emissaries had made sure of support from within; and when a small mixed force of Scots, French mercenaries, and English exiles crossed the Tweed just before Easter, they were put in possession of Dunstanburgh and the impregnable Bamborough. This was managed by the passive connivance of Sir Ralph Percy, who thus abused the confidence which King Edward had shown at Christmas, when he restored him to his estates. A few weeks later, on May 1, Sir Ralph Grey betrayed Alnwick to the Lancastrians; he had expected to be made captain of the place, and in disgust at having another placed over his head admitted Hungerford and the exiles within the walls. Thus all the work of Warwick's campaign in November-December, 1462, was undone, and ere long Queen Margaret and her hus-

band crossed the Tweed, and took up their abode at Bam-
borough, having in their company De Brézé, the Duke of Exe-
ter, Lord Roos, and Scots, English, and French to the number
of 2,000 men.

CHAP.
XVII.

Once more Warwick took his way to the north to do his master's work. He found the enemy engaged in the siege of Norham, the one great castle in Northumberland which had not been betrayed to them. He determined to relieve it before taking other work in hand, and after crossing the Alne found his way intercepted by the queen's army, mainly composed of Scots, who were drawn up on a hillside near Great Ryle (July 10,? 1463). A battle seemed imminent, but a sudden panic fell upon the Lancastrian host, which dispersed without fighting. The Yorkists overtook Margaret as she made off with her son, a small escort, and her baggage. But quarrelling over the booty, the captors allowed her to escape in company with Prince Edward and a single young squire, apparently a Yorkist, who was struck with pity and compassion at the forlorn condition of the distressed queen. Taking up the young prince before him on his horse, and bidding Margaret mount behind, he carried them off in safety to a neighbouring wood. It was here that there occurred the celebrated meeting between the queen and the robber, of which legend has made so much. The main facts are true; Margaret threw herself upon the compassion of the outlaw, as she had already done on that of the young squire, adjured him to save the only son of his king, and was not disappointed. The man swore to bring them safe to Bam borough, and fulfilled his promise.¹

Warwick meanwhile had raised the siege of Norham, and driven the Scots across the Tweed, while the English exiles took refuge in Bam borough and Alnwick. A fortnight later the queen took her son and sailed off to Flanders, under the escort of De Brézé and the Duke of Exeter. She left her hus-

¹ The incident certainly happened at this time and no other; the chronicler Chastellain, who had the whole story from the queen's own mouth, within a few months after her flight from Bam borough, describes it as having happened after "*ceste honteuse retraite, que firent les Escots devant Rel,*" and "*à la dernière maleurée déconfiture ou elle fut prise et saisie, avec les tresors lesquels cuidoit aller sauver en Écosse*" (iv., 278). This dating shows that it cannot be identified with the story in Gregory, p. 209, as Sir James Ramsay (ii., 236) holds.

CHAP.
XVII.

band, whom she was never to see again, safe in Bamborough, proposing to return in the next spring with reinforcements from France sufficient to restore his cause. But her expectations were deceived; in her absence the war in Northumberland came to an end. After her departure the Scottish government at last consented to a truce, and agreed to refrain from further support of the Lancastrian exiles; Angus, the fighting man of the war party, was now dead, and Bishop Kennedy, his colleague, after keeping Henry VI. at St. Andrews for some months was constrained to turn him adrift. The unfortunate king moved down into Northumberland, where he joined the remnants of his party, who still held Alnwick, Bamborough, and Dunstanburgh.

In the next spring occurred the last desperate rally of the Lancastrian party. It began with the wholly unexpected revolt of the Duke of Somerset, who, though he had been loaded with gifts and caresses by King Edward,¹ had slept in his chamber and served as captain of his guard, broke away at the new year and fled to Alnwick with a small following. Whether it was that his position had been rendered unbearable by the taunts of the Yorkists about the king's person, or that his conscience had been pricking him, he certainly deserted the winning cause at the eleventh hour. Soon after Jasper of Pembroke made a final attempt to stir up North Wales, and a rising took place in Cheshire and Lancashire, in which 10,000 men are said to have been for a moment in the field. Moreover, the Northumbrian rebels surprised Norham, and pushed a detachment into Yorkshire, which seized the castle of Skipton-in-Craven.

These outbreaks called the indefatigable Warwick and Montagu once more into the field. In March the earl set out for a third time to pacify the north. The Cheshire rebellion collapsed at his approach, and he then pushed on to the border to negotiate a permanent peace with the Scots. Meanwhile his brother brought the Lancastrians to an open battle at Hedgeley Moor, near Wooler, on April 25, 1464. Headed by Roos and Hungerford, Tailboys Lord of Kyme, and Sir Ralph Percy, they set upon him, but were beaten off with loss, Percy

¹ See *Engl. Hist. Review*, xxi., 300 (1906).

being slain. Three weeks later they had collected their last levies, and Somerset had assumed command. On May 15 they were arrayed on the Linnels, three miles from Hexham, and challenged Montagu to another fight. But when he closed with them, and they saw his superior numbers, all melted away from Somerset's banner, save 500 lances. Those who stopped to fight were surrounded by the Yorkists, and nearly the whole of the leaders were captured. Montagu celebrated his victory by the most bloody series of executions that had taken place during the whole war. Somerset was beheaded on the field, along with Sir Edmund Fitzhugh. Two days later the Lords Roos and Hungerford and Sir Thomas Findern were executed at Newcastle. Sir William Tailboys and Sir Philip Wentworth followed them to the block a little later. Finally Montagu conducted to York Sir Thomas Hussey and thirteen more captives, who were brought before the king, tried by the constable, Tip-toft Earl of Worcester, and beheaded in a batch,

Edward created Montagu Earl of Northumberland as a reward for his good service at Hedgeley and Hexham, and sent him back to the front once more to finish the campaign, lingering himself in Yorkshire. When the besiegers appeared before Alnwick on June 23 the garrison surrendered at once: Dunstanburgh and Norham followed the example of Alnwick. Only Bamborough held out; Sir Ralph Grey, the governor, knew that his treachery in betraying the castle would never be pardoned, and gave a rough refusal to the herald who summoned him. But the Yorkists had brought up the king's battering train of great guns, and the ancient walls of Bamborough began to crumble before their fire, "so that the stones flew into the sea". A breach was made, and the place was stormed about July 10. Grey was severely wounded, but unhappily survived long enough to be sent to the king, and to be tried at Doncaster by the merciless Earl of Worcester. He was beheaded on July 15, and his head sent to be set up over the gate of London bridge.¹ Though King Henry had still to be captured, the first act of the Wars of the Roses was now at an end. With the fall of Bamborough the Lancastrian resistance in the north was

¹ For interesting details of Grey's defence, the bombardment, and the trial at Doncaster, see the narrative in the *Heralds' College*, printed in *Chronicles of the White Rose*, pp. lxxxvi.-ix.

CHAP. XVII. extinguished. Already, before it was stormed, the Scots had signed a permanent peace on June 1, 1464, and there was no longer a refuge and a base of operations for the exiled followers of Margaret beyond the Tweed. All fled over-seas save Jasper of Pembroke, who wandered for some time in Wales, "going from county to county, nowhere finding safety, comfort or support". King Edward was triumphant; it only remained to be seen how he would face the problems of peace, now that, thanks to the Nevilles, he had done with the problems of war.

NOTE.

ON THE EARL OF WARWICK'S MOVEMENTS IN THE SUMMER OF 1464.

It has been generally supposed that it was Warwick who took Alnwick and Bamborough in June and July, 1464. This is stated by several chronicles as well as by the interesting document in the Heralds' College quoted on the preceding page. It would appear, however, that he had left the north after Hexham, had reached London by June 14, and was over-seas on an embassy to Burgundy in July. These facts are proved by a document (*King's Remembrancer's Accounts*, Bundle 324, No. 21) in the Record Office, which will be printed in the *English Historical Review* for October, 1906, by Miss Cora Scofield, giving Warwick's itinerary and expenses "anno quarto," June 14 to August 4. I am indebted for this information to the Editor of the Review.

CHAPTER XVIII.

EDWARD IV. AND THE EARL OF WARWICK.

THE northern war of which we have been reading had been a purely local affair. Since Towton the greater part of England had been enjoying what passed for peace and quiet in the fifteenth century. While Warwick and Montagu were subduing and re-subduing the Northumbrian castles, Edward IV. had reigned as undisputed master for three years in the south. He was now a grown man, no longer the mere lad of nineteen whom Warwick had placed upon the throne in 1461. The long absences of the king-maker had given the king leisure to develop upon his own lines. In everything save the highest affairs of state he now felt himself independent of his cousin. In the arts of popularity he even surpassed the earl, though their methods were different : Warwick depended on fluent oratory, high protestations of patriotism, and a liberality that bordered on excess ; the king's stock-in-trade was a handsome person, high spirits, and a pleasant familiarity of manner. Edward had already gathered around himself a host of personal followers who did not owe their rise to the patronage of the Nevilles. In minor matters they did his work and provided for his amusement, and he had discovered that his ideas both on work and on play were very different from those of Warwick. If Edward had been less indolent and easy-going, friction between him and his cousin must have begun much earlier. But while the Lancastrians were still unsubdued, he allowed the earl to have his own way in all political matters, and amused himself as he pleased. Though before and after this time he proved himself an excellent soldier, he never once went to the front in the years 1462-4, always lingering at York or Durham when the war was afoot in Northumberland. Since he was cursed neither with a want of capacity nor a want of courage, it must have been

CHAP
XVIII.

CHAP. mere preference for pleasure rather than hard work that kept
XVIII. him back.

The purely domestic affairs of the south do not seem to have been troublesome, though there was the same normal amount of local feuds and riots, highway robbery, and abduction, which had prevailed in the days of Henry VI., though it tended to decrease when the chaos of 1461 was ended. If the *Paston Letters* show us much lawlessness, even in such a rich and settled county as Norfolk, we may guess that Herefordshire and Cornwall were not comfortable domiciles for a person of quiet tastes. But Edward could give justice even when a small man was embroiled with a great man, and the central authority does not seem to have been in the same state of collapse that had been seen in the later years of Henry VI.

As to parliamentary affairs, the early years of King Edward demand little notice after the session of 1461 and its sweeping bills of attainder. The most striking feature of the time is the moderation of the king's demands for money, while he still had a considerable civil war upon his hands. The parliament of 1461 made no grants; in 1462 the houses assembled in May only to be dissolved immediately. In 1463 there was at last a vote of supply; in June the Commons gave the king an aid of £37,000 for the defence of the realm, of which £6,000 was afterwards remitted. There was no more money asked or given in 1464, but in January, 1465, the Commons voted the king tonnage and poundage and the usual subsidy on wool for the term of his natural life; hitherto he had been receiving them under the old grants made to Henry VI., a somewhat illogical and undignified proceeding on the part of a legitimist king. Altogether the nation got off with very little taxation between 1461 and 1465. The king, as it would seem, was living, if not "of his own," at least on the confiscated estates of the attainted Lancastrians, though it is difficult to trace the enormous amounts which he must have received from this source in the accounts of his exchequer.¹

Foreign policy meanwhile was a simple business; Louis of France having thrown in his lot with the Lancastrians, in the vain hope of acquiring Calais, the only course open to the Eng-

¹ See Ramsay's *Lancaster and York*, ii., 311 and 459.

lish government was to seek the alliance of Burgundy. Duke Philip was old and unenterprising, but he saw that it was not to his interest that Louis should recover Calais, or obtain control over England by replacing Henry VI. upon the throne. It was, as we have already seen, owing to his interference that De Brézé's expedition was cut down in numbers, and that the schemes against Calais never came to maturity. A year later Margaret in her flight from Bamborough came ashore in Flanders; Philip was chivalrous enough not to detain the distressed queen; he would not, however, listen to her pleadings and politely escorted her out of his dominions, after making her a gift of 2,000 gold crowns.¹ By this time the King of France had realised that the cause of Lancaster was desperate, and that no profit could be got out of the alliance to which he had committed himself in 1462. On October 8, 1464, his envoys signed a year's truce with England, the chancellor, George Neville, having come over to Hesdin for the purpose. It was now Louis's object to bid against Burgundy for the favour of Warwick and King Edward, and he was eager to demonstrate that his friendship would be more profitable to the Yorkist dynasty than that of Duke Philip. The most important personage in England was at one with him in this view; Warwick thought that the best policy for England was to conclude a permanent peace with France, and to make sure that the Lancastrians should never again be succoured from across the Channel.

It is possible that the earl's views were also influenced by commercial considerations; the restoration of the long-suspended trade with France could not fail to benefit the English mercantile classes, whose support he was anxious to retain. He thought that it was possible to be friendly with France, yet not to break with Burgundy. But if it was necessary to choose between the two, he held that Louis would be the more useful ally. When the civil wars had at last come to an end, he offered to go to France in person to conduct the negotiation. It was his aim to clinch them by a marriage treaty; King Edward was now in his twenty-fourth year, "and men marvelled that he abode so long without a wife, and feared that he was not over chaste of his living".¹ He had shown no eagerness to close with sug-

¹ Gregory, p. 226.

CHAP. XVIII. gestions made in 1462 and 1463 that he should wed the young Queen-dowager of Scotland, Mary of Guelders, or Isabella of Castile, sister of the reigning Spanish king. But now much stronger pressure was put upon him; Warwick used all his influence to induce him to sue for the hand of the Princess Bona of Savoy, sister of the Queen of France. Her name had been suggested by Louis himself, who had no marriageable daughter or sister of his own to offer. But when hard pressed by Warwick to assent to the match, at a meeting of the privy council held at Reading just before Michaelmas, Edward discomfited his councillors by a startling announcement. He declared to them that he was already married. On the preceding May 1 he had secretly espoused the Lady Elizabeth Grey, widow of John Grey, Lord Ferrers of Groby, a Lancastrian who had fallen at the second battle of St. Albans.

This marriage was as unexpected as it was undesirable. The Lady Grey was five years older than the king, and was the mother of children eleven or twelve years of age. Her antecedents were wholly Lancastrian. Her father, the Lord Rivers who had been captured at Sandwich by Warwick's men in 1460, was "a made lord, who had won his fortune by his marriage". A mere country knight by birth, Sir Richard Woodville had been steward to John Duke of Bedford. When his master died, he found favour in the eyes of the young widowed duchess, Jacquette of Luxemburg, and became her second husband. She was considered to have married far beneath her, and fined £1,000 by the council. But Henry VI., when he came of age, took Woodville into favour and raised him to the peerage. As was natural the newly-created Lord Rivers started as a strong Lancastrian: his eldest son married the heiress of Warwick's old enemy, Lord Scales, his eldest daughter wedded an equally sound adherent of King Henry, the Lord Ferrers. Fortunately for himself Rivers was in bonds when Northampton and Towton were fought. A spell of captivity sufficed to shake his loyalty: he did homage to King Edward, and emerged from his prison a Yorkist. The king, as a chronicler phrases it, "being a lusty prince, attempted the stability and constant modesty of divers ladies and gentlewomen, but he could not perceive none of such constant womanhood, wisdom and beauty as was Dame Elizabeth Grey".¹ He had

¹ Hearne's *Fragment*, p. 15.

made hot love to her, but she was clever and cautious, kept her head, and would hear of nothing save lawful marriage. After a moment's hesitation the young king resolved that he could not live without her. While on his way with his army to York during the spring of 1464, he secretly withdrew with a few companions to Grafton in Northamptonshire, where Elizabeth was residing, and there wedded her in the presence of her mother, the duchess, and three other persons only. The secret had been kept for five months, and was only disclosed when it was impossible for the king to avoid the French marriage in any other fashion.

The lords of the council were no less astounded than vexed by this sudden revelation. Warwick in particular was indignant that he should have been suffered to commit himself so deeply to the French king, when his scheme was futile from the first. He had now to explain to Louis that he had been duped, and excluded from his master's confidence. Nevertheless he swallowed his wrath, bowed to necessity, and on September 29 joined with the young Duke of Clarence in conducting Dame Elizabeth to her chair of state, when she was publicly enthroned as queen in Reading Abbey. He imagined that the king's freak did not necessarily imply a breach with the house of Neville, all the more so that Edward had chosen this moment to promote his brother the chancellor to the vacant Archbishopric of York.¹ A month later the royal favour was again displayed, when Warwick was sent as his master's representative to prorogue a parliament which had been summoned to meet on November 4.

Nevertheless the day on which the king's marriage was avouched was the turning-point in the history of the relations of Edward and the earl. From that time onward Warwick ceased to have complete confidence in the king, and the king began to take occasions of showing that he was not wholly dependent on Warwick. The first method which he adopted was to shower benefits on the relatives of his wife. The Woodvilles were a prolific race; the queen had five brothers, seven sisters, and two sons, and for the next two years the royal influence was exercised for the advancement of well-nigh every

¹ The *congé d'élire* was issued on the day before the announcement of the marriage.

CHAP. one of them. Her eldest brother Anthony was already a peer,
XVIII. in right of his wife, the heiress of Lord Scales; her second brother Lionel was destined for the Church. But the rest of her relations were free to marry, and married they were with small delay to the greatest matches in England. Only a few days after the ceremonies at Reading, her eldest sister, Margaret, was wedded to Thomas Lord Maltravers, the heir of the Earl of Arundel. In January, 1465, her fourth brother, John Woodville, married the Dowager Duchess of Norfolk. This was a public scandal—*maritagium diabolicum*, exclaims an indignant chronicler¹—for the lady was old enough to be the grandmother of the sordid young man, and apparently consented to take him mainly in order to disoblige her relations. Next year no less than three Woodville brides were married almost simultaneously to the sons of great peers—Anne to William Lord Bouchier, heir of the Earl of Essex; Eleanor to Anthony Grey, heir of the Earl of Kent;² Catherine, most highly exalted of all, to the young Duke of Buckingham, the grandson of the faithful Lancastrian who fell at Northampton. This last match is said to have caused special displeasure to Warwick.³ Two more marriages in 1465-66 still remain to be chronicled. The queen's fourth sister Jacquette, named after her mother, was wedded to Lord Strange of Knockyn, and Mary Woodville to William Herbert, the eldest son of Lord Herbert, the king's most intimate personal friend. Thus there was built up a compact family group of peers all allied to the queen, and owing nothing to the Nevilles. Clearly it was not inordinate affection for his wife, but deliberate policy, which induced the king to carry out this long series of marriages.

Meanwhile, however, Warwick was still to all appearance the most trusted servant of the crown. During the spring and summer of 1465 he was employed on a long mission to France and Burgundy. With the old Duke Philip the relations of the house of York had always been friendly; but his health was failing, and at any moment he might be succeeded by his son

¹ William of Worcester, p. 83. She was over seventy; he twenty-one.

² Not William Neville, Earl of Kent, who died in 1463, but the Lord Grey of Ruthyn, promoted in 1465 to the same title. The Christian name of this Woodville sister is not quite certain.

³ William of Worcester, p. 85, "ad secretam displacentiam comitis Warreiwici".

Charles of Charolais, who generally took a different line from his father. At this particular moment Charles had joined himself to the "League of the Public Weal," which included not only the Dukes of Berry, Brittany, and Bourbon, but Queen Margaret's father René of Provence and her brother John Duke of Calabria. Intent on humbling King Louis, he would have nothing to do with Warwick, who passed as the partisan of France. Far other was the conduct of Louis: desirous of keeping Edward IV. out of the "League of the Public Weal" he conceded everything that Warwick asked; he consented to renew the existing truce with England for eighteen months, to enter into no treaties with Queen Margaret, and to expel all Lancastrian exiles from France. In return the earl covenanted that Charolais, Berry, and Brittany should receive no aid from beyond the channel.

Late in July Warwick returned to England, just in time to hear of a new stroke of fortune that had befallen his master. Henry VI. had been captured in Lancashire. Ever since the peace with Scotland, which denied him a refuge beyond the Tweed, the unhappy ex-king had been wandering in an aimless way from one Lancastrian household to another, disguised and accompanied only by two chaplains. At the end of two years he was betrayed by one of his entertainers, John Talbot of Basshall, and apprehended by Sir James Harrington, who sent him to London. Warwick was detailed to meet the prisoner at Islington, and led him through the city. After having been paraded along Cheapside and Cornhill he was placed in the Tower, where he was kept in custody for five years. Though suffering occasionally from the rudeness of his jailers, he does not seem to have been treated with cruelty. Indeed persons of all sorts were permitted to visit him freely, a sufficient guarantee that he was safe from any gross ill-usage.

The last occasion on which Warwick appeared in full favour with the king was at the baptism of Edward's eldest child, Elizabeth, in February, 1466, when he was asked to act as godfather. A few weeks later began the first open signs of a breach; in March the king appointed Lord Rivers, the queen's father, treasurer of England, removing Warwick's uncle by marriage, Lord Mountjoy, and in May created Rivers an earl. Warwick's displeasure, though not openly expressed, was noted by keen ob-

CHAP.
XVIII.

servers. But the friction grew worse when in October the queen interfered in a marriage which had been settled between Warwick's nephew, George Neville, son of the Earl of Northumberland, and the Lady Anne Holland, only child of the exiled Duke of Exeter, and heiress to such of his lands and titles as the king might think fit to restore. Elizabeth gave the child's mother 4,000 marks to break off the betrothal, and wedded her to Thomas Grey, her own eldest son by her first husband. The whole Neville family was incensed at seeing the heiress carried away from them, and taken into the Woodville connection.

Nor was this all: Warwick also had marriage schemes on foot; his daughter Isabella was now fifteen years of age; it was high time that her father should find her a spouse. He might naturally look high for her mate; there were, since Buckingham had been wedded to Catherine Woodville, only two dukes in England who were free—the king's brothers, Clarence and Gloucester. The latter was a mere lad of fourteen, but Clarence was four years older. It is probable that the earl had long had the match in his mind; he certainly opened his proposals to Duke George in the autumn of 1466. The young man was willing; even a royal prince might be satisfied with the splendid prospect of obtaining half of the lands of Montagu, Neville, and Beauchamp. The young pair were cousins, so that a papal dispensation would be required, but that could easily be obtained. When, however, the rumour of the negotiations came to King Edward's ears he showed extreme reluctance to see the match completed. He cross-questioned his brother, who prevaricated shamelessly, and informed him that he did not approve of the scheme. For the present there was no more talk of it, but Warwick and Clarence were not prepared to let it drop; they remained in close alliance, and the king—as we shall see—showed in the next year that he included his brother in the disfavour with which he now regarded the Nevilles.

It was not, however, till 1467 that the final rupture between the king and the earl took place. Its ostensible cause was a difference of opinion on high matters of foreign policy; Charles of Charolais, though the "League of the Public Weal" was now a thing of the past, was still engaged in his struggle with King Louis, and had come to the conclusion that he had acted un-

wisely in rejecting an alliance with England in 1466. He reopened negotiations with the Yorkist government, and made his application not to Warwick but to King Edward himself. Having lately lost his wife, Isabella of Bourbon, he was free to contract another marriage, and offered his hand to the Lady Margaret, the youngest and only unmarried sister of the king. Edward welcomed the proposal; but he was at first constrained to dissemble, for Warwick and all his party in the council continued to urge the superior advantages of the French alliance. But it could not be denied that there were great mercantile and other benefits to be derived from an understanding with Burgundy, and that such an understanding did not necessarily involve a breach with King Louis. Warwick, though most unwilling, was sent over to St. Omer in October, 1466, authorised to negotiate a commercial treaty with Charles and to discuss the marriage. It is said that he made no genuine endeavour to carry out the latter part of his instructions, being bitterly opposed to the scheme. No definite agreement was reached, though both Edward and Charles were anxious to carry the affair to a conclusion. At last they resolved to do so over Warwick's head, and in spite of his wiles.

The method adopted shows the terror which the earl still inspired in his master's breast. In May, 1467, Edward feigned to be convinced by the earl's arguments that the French alliance was the more profitable for England; Warwick was sent overseas to visit King Louis, and authorised to discuss a permanent treaty of peace and amity, as also to make arrangements for free commercial intercourse between the two countries. The embassy, however, was devised merely to get him out of the country; he was hardly gone before there appeared in London Antony the Bastard of Burgundy, the half-brother of Charles. Ostensibly he came to joust with the queen's brother, Lord Scales, really he was entrusted with powers to conclude the marriage treaty. While Warwick was being received in state at Rouen, and concluding a satisfactory arrangement with King Louis, all his work was being undone behind his back. After a stay of twelve days in Normandy he returned, bringing with him a French embassy, headed by the Archbishop of Narbonne, and the Bastard of Bourbon, Admiral of France. These envoys were authorised to enter into a definitive treaty with King

CHAP.
XVIII.

Edward on Warwick's terms, and to offer him in addition a pension of 4,000 marks a year.

Landing in England on the last day of June, the earl received most untoward news. The king had received the Bastard of Burgundy and settled with him the arrangements for the marriage of the Princess Margaret with the Count of Charolais. But this was not all: on June 8 Edward had publicly notified his revolt against the tutelage of the Nevilles, by dismissing his chancellor, George Neville, Archbishop of York, and giving the great seal to Bishop Stillington of Bath and Wells. Despite of this, Warwick discharged his duty by presenting the French ambassadors to his master. Edward received them, listened in an abstracted way to their compliments and offers, and then remarked that he was much pressed with business, and that certain lords of his council would give them his reply in due time. He then went off to Windsor, leaving the envoys much abashed, and Warwick in a towering rage. As he conducted them back to their lodgings, the earl was indiscreet enough to remark to the Admiral of France that there were now none but traitors about the king. After waiting six weeks in vain for the promised communication from the council, the ambassadors departed to Sandwich, escorted by Warwick. After he had sent them off with all courtesy, he retired to his castle of Middleham, and there abode in high dudgeon.

Glad of his absence, Edward published in September the formal news of the betrothal of his sister to Charles, who had now, by the death of his aged father in June, become Duke of Burgundy. At Christmas the king summoned Warwick to court, but the earl replied that he dared not come while such traitors as Lord Rivers, Lord Scales, and Lord Herbert were about his master's person. He had good reason to fear them, for they had already made an attempt to accuse him of treasonable plots. Lord Herbert sent up from Wales a man who was caught bearing messages of Queen Margaret to her adherents, and who said that he knew that Warwick was enlisted in her cause. Edward, however, would not take up the matter, rightly judging the confession to be a desperate effort of the emissary to save his own neck by turning king's evidence.

If, however, the earl was not intriguing with his old enemy

Margaret, it is certain that he was conferring with all his own kinsmen and adherents concerning the state of the realm. Clarence had openly committed himself to his cause, and they were suing in common at Rome for a dispensation to enable the duke to wed the Lady Isabel. The matter, however, was delayed by the efforts of the king's agents at the papal court. It would seem that many of Warwick's dependants, with or without his knowledge, were ready to raise trouble against the king's new favourites. On New Year's day, 1468, a mob devastated one of Rivers's estates in Kent, and it was said that in Yorkshire 300 archers had appeared in arms under a captain named Robin, demanding leave to fall upon all traitors, and had only gone home because the great earl told them that it was not yet time for them to be stirring.¹ This premature apparition of the "Robin of Redesdale," who was to be so notorious in 1469, is a clear proof that the adherents of the Nevilles judged that their chief intended ere long to take up the part that the Lords Appellant had played in 1387, and to make a clean sweep of the favourites.

But it took a year more of friction to turn the king-maker's discontent into open treason. In January, 1468, he made a last attempt to arrive at an understanding with his ungrateful master; he joined the court at Coventry, and was there formally reconciled to Lord Rivers. If he hoped to purchase by such a sacrifice a restoration to his old influence in the king's councils, he must soon have been disappointed. The Burgundian marriage went on; the contract was signed in February, and the lady escorted to her embarkation at Margate by Warwick himself in June. But he had hoped at least to keep the king from war with France; he knew that Louis did not desire it, and thought that the interests of England were best served by peace. Edward, however, was determined to emulate Henry V., and thought, like that prince, that successful war abroad was the surest way to make men forget old domestic quarrels. He announced that when the existing truce with King Louis ran out, it should not be renewed, and that he should invade France in company with his Burgundian brother-in-law and the Duke

¹ This is from the letter of Monipenny, the Scottish agent of Louis XI., to his master. He says that this Robin rose in Surfiorkshire, which strange word seems to mean South Yorkshire.

CHAP. of Brittany. Parliament was summoned on May 12, 1468, to
XVIII. grant him the necessary supplies. Hitherto his demands on the public purse had been so moderate that he might well count on a generous response, when at last he made his appeal to the Commons. Chancellor Stillington harangued the houses in the old style of the ministers of Edward III., stating that it was the purpose of the king "to go over the sea into France, and to subdue his great rebel and adversary Louis, usurpant king of the same, and to recover his duchies and lordships of Normandy, Guienne, and other". The Commons, apparently with some enthusiasm, voted the liberal grant of two tenths and two fifteenths, and were then dissolved on June 7.

But the first effect of the declaration of war on France was an unexpected one. Louis XI., driven to fight, used the weapons at which he was best, the subornation of treason and revolt among his enemy's subjects. He allied himself once more with Queen Margaret, recalled the Lancastrian exiles to his court, and set to work to open communication with the relics of the defeated faction in England. Jasper Tudor with a small body of mercenaries was put ashore in Wales, where he stirred up considerable commotion and burnt the town of Denbigh. Lord Herbert beat him in the field, but could not catch him, nor suppress the insurrection that he had started. He captured, however, Harlech Castle, which had never before yielded to the Yorkists. To reward him for this exploit the king granted him the earldom of Pembroke, of which Jasper had been deprived by the act of attainder of 1461. This rising in Wales was not the only sign of Lancastrian energy in 1468; a conspiracy in London was detected, with ramifications all over the south. There was a great trial at the Guildhall in July, at which Sir Thomas Coke, late Mayor of London, and many others were tried before a special commission, for having received letters from Queen Margaret and made her promises. Two only of the accused were executed, but Coke was fined £8,000 for misprision of treason. There were more trials and executions in the autumn; the most important arrests were those of Sir Thomas Hungerford and Sir Henry Courtenay, heirs to the forfeited titles and honours of Hungerford and Devon, who were taken in the west, tried at Salisbury, and executed in January, 1469. John de Vere, heir to the earldom of Oxford, narrowly

escaped the same fate, but was pardoned. These plots were supported by the mustering of a French fleet at Harfleur, in which it was vainly reported that Queen Margaret herself was ready to sail. With the prospect of a Lancastrian rebellion ready to break out behind him, King Edward never dared to visit France to assail "his great rebel and adversary," Louis XI. All his warlike talk had no greater result than the equipment of a fleet under Lord Scales to keep the Channel. This eldest of the Woodvilles was an incompetent admiral; he made two inglorious cruises in the Channel, and returned without having seen an enemy. Meanwhile the whole scheme for the general assault on France was frustrated by the weakness and folly of Charles of Burgundy, who allowed himself to be bribed into making a truce with France in October, thus treacherously abandoning his allies, and sacrificing a good opportunity of crushing Louis.

Edward seems to have been so engrossed with Lancastrian plots during the autumn of 1468 and the spring of 1469, that he had little attention to spare for a much more dangerous conspiracy that was brewing. Warwick had made arrangements for an insurrection, and had enlisted Clarence in all his plans. The whole Neville house was organised for a rising; Fauconberg was dead, Latimer was now an old man, but their places in the family council were taken by their sons, Henry Neville, heir of Latimer, and Thomas Neville, the "Bastard of Fauconberg"; with these were associated Sir John Conyers of Hornby, husband of Fauconberg's daughter Alice; Lord Fitzhugh, Warwick's cousin, and Sir John Sutton, who had married Henry Neville's sister. The ex-chancellor, George Archbishop of York, was deep in the plot; but there is some doubt whether Warwick's other brother, Montagu, who professed loyalty to the king, was implicated. In April, 1469, Warwick went over to Calais with his wife and daughters; as he was still captain of that great fortress his conduct roused no surprise. In May he paid a visit to the new Duchess of Burgundy at St. Omer, apparently with the object of blinding both her and his master at home to the imminence of his hostile intentions. It was at this juncture that he met the Burgundian chronicler Wavrin, who confesses that he was entirely deceived by the earl's frank geniality, and never suspected what he had in hand.

CHAP.
XVIII.

In June the earl fired his train: according to his arrangements the troubles began in Yorkshire. The whole county was bidden to rise in the name of "Robin of Redesdale," a nickname which seems to have covered the personality of Sir John Conyers.¹ At first we are told that the rebels were led by "unnamed gentlemen," but soon all the Nevilles in the north were seen at the head of their tenants under the mysterious Robin's standard. The situation was much complicated by the outburst of a separate, and apparently a Lancastrian, rising at the same moment; it was headed by one Robert Hilyard who, in rivalry with the other leader, called himself "Robin of Holderness". This insurrection had as its war cry the restoration of the attainted Percies to their old estates. But Montagu put down Hilyard's bands in the name of King Edward, and slew their leader at York. Whether he acted as an honest adherent of the king, or whether he was merely determined that his new earldom should not go back to the Percies, it is impossible to say. At any rate he executed Robin of Holderness and left Robin of Redesdale alone.

Early in July the Yorkshire insurgents began to move southward, having just published a manifesto in the same style as that which the Lords Appellant had issued against Richard II. It stated that the realm was out of governance, that the king was in the hands of corrupt and treacherous favourites, that his revenues were being wasted, and that his taxation was intolerable, a most unjust charge to bring against a sovereign who had asked extraordinarily little from his parliaments. Of course it was added that the king had excluded from his counsels "the true lords of his blood," and preferred to be guided by "seductious" persons such as Rivers, Scales, and Herbert. Plain reference was made to the fact that Edward II. and Richard II. had fallen from similar exhibitions of folly and perversity. The moment that King Edward heard of the Yorkshire rising, he gave orders for the raising of an army, and advanced to Nottingham (July 9). But he had little armed force with him save a bodyguard of 200 mounted archers which he had raised in 1468, and was constrained to wait for the arrival of his lieutenants before going further; Herbert, the Earl of Pem-

¹ So Warkworth, p. 110, a better authority than Hall and the others who make him some one else.

broke, was bringing him the troops of Wales and the Marches; Humphrey Lord Stafford, who had been created Earl of Devon only three weeks before, had been entrusted with the conduct of the men of the south and the west. CHAP.
XVIII.

When Warwick knew that Edward had started for the north, and had his attention fixed on Robin of Redesdale, he developed the second half of his plan. On July 11 the Duke of Clarence was wedded to Isabella Neville at Calais by the Archbishop of York, in open disobedience to the king's commands. Next day Warwick, his new son-in-law, and his brother published a manifesto, to the effect that they adhered to the cause of the "king's true subjects," now up in arms, who had "called upon them with piteous lamentations to be the means to our Sovereign Lord the King of remedy and reformation". They republished the manifesto of the Yorkshire rebels, testified to its righteousness, and promised to be at Canterbury within four days, where all good men were invited to meet them "defensibly arrayed". Warwick was as good as his word; he crossed the straits at the head of the Calais garrison, was joined by many thousands of the Kentishmen, and marched on London unopposed, at the moment when all the king's forces were moving northward. The capital opened its gates without resistance; the name of Warwick was still greater than that of the king with the Londoners. The earl then moved northward on Northampton, to attack the royalists in the rear. But before he had reached the front the campaign was over.

The Yorkshiremen, seeing that Edward was at Nottingham with only a small force, had resolved to throw themselves between him and the succours that were advancing to his aid. Marching by Doncaster and Derby, they reached Leicester, thus cutting off the king from his reinforcements. Edward, who had just heard of Warwick's landing, was at last seriously alarmed; the spirit of his army was bad, and Lord Mountjoy warned him that if he wished his men to fight he had better send away the unpopular Woodvilles from his camp. Accordingly Rivers and his son John fled to the Welsh border, and took refuge at Chepstow Castle, while Scales joined his sister, the queen, at Cambridge. The king then moved south to Northampton, perhaps hoping to join his reinforcements by a circuitous route,

CHAP.
XVIII.

But the rebels were too quick for him: Conyers and Henry Neville, whose generalship seems to have been excellent, had pushed southward once more, and brought the royalists to action. Pembroke, with his Welsh and Marchmen, and Devon, with the levies of Wiltshire, Gloucestershire, and Devon, had met at Banbury on July 25. There the two earls had a fierce personal dispute, and Devon, refusing to march with Pembroke, fell back ten miles. Next morning the northern host appeared, and Pembroke was challenged to battle on Danesmoor, near Edgcott, six miles north-east of Banbury. He refused to wait for Devon, attacked the enemy, and was thoroughly beaten, "for want of archery," his Welsh forces being nearly all spearmen. The fight was fierce and indecisive, till there came on the field an advance party of Warwick's army from London, headed by Thomas Clapham, and containing some of the earl's household men and of the garrison of Calais.¹ Their arrival turned the fate of the day; Pembroke and his brother, Sir Richard Herbert, were taken prisoners, and a great slaughter was made of their followers, of whom it is said that 168 knights, squires, and gentlemen perished, with 2,000 of the common soldiery. The victory had been by no means bloodless; the rebels had lost Henry Neville, the heir of Latimer, Sir James Conyers, the son of their general, Sir Oliver Dudley, another of the Neville family group, and many more. The Earl of Devon, arriving too late for the fight, saw his levies disperse, and fled back into the south.

The Yorkshiremen next morning beheaded Pembroke and his brother at Northampton, undoubtedly with the approval, if not by the actual command, of Warwick, who came up on that day, July 27. Meanwhile King Edward, hastening south from Nottingham, found his enemies all around him, while his own force began to disperse on the news of Edgcott field. Only a few faithful followers still lingered about him when on the 28th he was beset at Olney,² by a body of Warwick's retainers, headed by the Archbishop of York. They captured him and took him off to the earl. It is unfortunate that no chronicler

¹ Hearne's *Fragment*, p. 24.

² Olney in Bucks, on the edge of Northamptonshire (Warkworth, p. 112), seems to be the place, despite the statements of Hall and Wavrin. Honiley, which some have suggested, does not seem a likely spot for the king to have reached.

records the details of the meeting of the entrapped king and his revengeful cousin. Edward heard hard words, and learnt that he was only to keep his throne on hard conditions. But life and crown were safe, for Warwick was still the champion of Yorkist interests. For a month the king was the earl's captive, first at Warwick and Coventry, afterwards in the great Neville stronghold of Middleham. While he was thus detained his conqueror took vengeance upon the favourites who had supplanted him. The Earl of Devon was seized and beheaded at Bridgwater. Lord Rivers and his son John Woodville were captured in Chepstow Castle, from whence they were brought to Kenilworth and there executed, without any pretence of legal trial. Scales had escaped and taken sanctuary. His enemies being dead, Warwick proceeded to release his master, after having compelled him to sign pardons for all who had been engaged in the late insurrection, including himself and Clarence. Warwick made few official changes. Sir John Langstrother was made treasurer in the place of Lord Rivers, but Bishop Stillington was left as chancellor, apparently because he had made no enemies in his two years of office.

Warwick's loyalty to the cause of York was proved when, in September, he put down a new Lancastrian disturbance in the north, and executed its leader Sir Humphrey Neville of Brancepeth, one of that elder (Westmorland) branch of his own house which had ever taken the opposite side to his own younger branch. Soon after the king was forced to betroth his eldest daughter, Elizabeth, a child of only four years, to Warwick's nearest male heir, George Neville, the son of the Earl of Northumberland. Edward was now the father of three little girls, but no male offspring had been born to him; and it is evident that Warwick was contemplating the possibility that the crown might pass to his eldest daughter. If so, it was to be secured for the house of Neville. The boy George Neville was created Duke of Bedford two months after his betrothal. Clearly Warwick had every reason to remain faithful to the house of York. That he did not intend to molest the queen, or to contest the validity of her marriage, was shown by the fact that he nipped in the bud a scheme for indicting her mother the Duchess Jacquette of sorcery. He had the charge quashed at a great council held in January, 1470.

CHAP.
XVIII.

Apparently Warwick thought that his master had been given a lesson that would last him for the rest of his life, when he released the humbled monarch and let him gather his court at London. Edward, it must be confessed, stooped to hypocrisy, and as one of the Pastons wrote in October, "had good language of my Lords of Clarence, Warwick, and York, saying they be his best friends: but his household men have other language, so that what shall hastily fall I cannot say".¹ The triumph of the Nevilles was only to last for six months. The king soon discovered that those lords of the old Yorkist party who were not of the Neville blood were perfectly content that the Woodvilles and Herberts should have been destroyed, but had no wish that all power should remain in the hands of Warwick and his relations. Norfolk, Arundel, the young Duke of Suffolk, and the Bouchiers, were of opinion that they had been too much ignored during the *coup d'état* of the preceding summer. The king found that he might count upon their support if he took measures to free himself from his present tutelage.

The occasion came in March. The greater portion of England had been disturbed ever since the first appearance of Robin of Redesdale; typical incidents of the time had been the private war of the Pastons with the Duke of Norfolk about Caistor, and the abortive rising of the Lancastrians in Yorkshire. There were ample reasons for the king's calling out an armed force to keep the peace of the realm. The immediate excuse that he chose was some riots in Lincolnshire, which had their origin in a dispute between Lord Welles and Sir Thomas de Burgh. Welles was an old Lancastrian, whose father had fallen at Towton; he had only been restored to his title and estates in 1468. The king, naturally, took sides in favour of De Burgh, who was one of his own household, summoned the riotous lord to London, and put him in ward. Thereupon his son, Sir Robert Welles, called out his tenants and adherents in open insurrection, and bade all Lincolnshire muster at Ranby Howe, near Horncastle, on March 6, proclaiming that the king had sworn to take severe vengeance on the county for the late riots. It is probable that the insurrection was really Lancastrian in character, for Lincolnshire was of all parts of England the one,

¹ *Paston Letters*, v., 63.

perhaps, in which the Nevilles had least interest and following. The great estates of the shire belonged partly to the duchy of Lancaster, partly to the houses of Welles, Beaumont, and Percy, old supporters of Henry VI.; the only important Yorkist was Lord Cromwell, one of the Bouchiers, and no friend of Warwick.

The king called out against this unimportant rising a great force from London and East Anglia, largely composed of the retainers of Norfolk, the Bouchiers, and other trusty persons. He had already marched out, when commissions were sent to Warwick and Clarence bidding them raise the levies of the west midlands in his aid. But ere they had got any large force together Edward had made an end of the rebels at the combat of "Lose-coat-field," near Empingham, so called from the curious spectacle of the Lincolnshire men casting off their tabards to fly the quicker. Lord Welles was executed in the king's camp before the battle; his son Sir Robert was caught and beheaded at Doncaster. When he was dead the king suddenly announced that his dying confession had implicated Warwick and Clarence in his treason; he therefore proclaimed them traitors, and ordered his army to march against them. They had just reached Chesterfield with a small force, which was utterly inadequate to face the king's great host. This would seem to have been Edward's revenge for the trick played upon him in the preceding year; the evidence alleged to prove the "traitors'" guilt was wholly inadequate, despite Welles's alleged confession, a most rambling document, and it seems probable that the rising had been Lancastrian and unconnected with Warwick. But having an army at his back the king could take his revenge. Warwick and Clarence fled southward, and were hotly pursued. Their flight did not cease till they reached Dartmouth, where they seized a few ships and put to sea, taking with them Warwick's countess and Clarence's young bride. The earl sought Calais, his old refuge in 1459, but was refused entry by the garrison, and finally landed at Honfleur and threw himself on the mercy of his friend Louis XI. Some of his followers had fallen into the king's hands; they were executed by the Constable Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, and their bodies impaled, an atrocity which shocked English sentiment, though it was no more ghastly than the drawing and quartering with which the public was familiar.

CHAP.
XVIII.

Louis XI. was delighted at the turn which matters had taken; he thought that he saw a chance of revenging himself on the Yorkist king, who had acted as his consistent enemy. He determined to reconcile Warwick and the exiled Queen Margaret, and to stir up by their aid a new English rebellion, in which the factions of Lancaster and Neville should combine. Accordingly he sent for the queen and her son, who were dwelling in her father René's duchy of Bar, and at Angers confronted them with Warwick and Clarence. At first it seemed that no agreement could be reached; both parties expressed their indignation at the mere suggestion of such an alliance. Warwick and Margaret had the blood of each other's nearest and dearest upon their hands. She had beheaded his father Salisbury in cold blood, and slain his uncle York and his cousin Rutland; he had done to death the two Somersets, Wiltshire, and many another of her friends. If she had attainted him at Coventry in 1459, he had stigmatised her son as a bastard or a changeling in 1460. They refused to meet for many days; but the cynical King of France could not see that even the bitterest blood-feud need keep apart those whom the logic of events pointed out as natural allies. When they had made an end of their common foe, Edward of York, they might settle their old grudges at leisure. After much recrimination, the queen and the earl were induced to come to terms. The strength of the Neville faction was to be placed at the disposal of the house of Lancaster, and the alliance was to be sealed by the marriage of Warwick's younger daughter Anne to Edward Prince of Wales, who had now reached his seventeenth year.¹ On August 4, 1470, they swore amity on a fragment of the true cross before the high altar of Angers cathedral.

The weak point in the bargain was that it did not satisfy Warwick's elder son-in-law, George of Clarence, who had hoped that if the cause of Neville ever prevailed, he himself would be made king in the place of his brother Edward. In the new treaty nothing was secured for him, save that his name was to be placed in the succession to the crown next after that of Margaret's son. If his father-in-law was victorious, he would

¹ For the details of the negotiation, see the invaluable "Manner and Guiding of the Earl of Warwick at Angiers," printed in the *Chronicles of the White Rose*, pp. 229-38.

only become once more the first prince of the blood royal—a position that he had already enjoyed from 1461 to 1469; that the house of Lancaster would die out was unlikely. Clarence dissembled his anger, and sent secret messages to his brother in England, begging for pardon, and undertaking to desert Warwick at the earliest opportunity. Of this the earl had not the slightest suspicion; Clarence was a skilful dissembler.

Meanwhile King Edward was taking life easily; he had driven Warwick out of England with so little trouble that he vainly imagined that the earl's power had been overrated—a grievous mistake; he had only triumphed without a battle because he had caught his enemy unawares. The exile was even now preparing for his return; his manifestoes were being secretly passed from hand to hand in the north and in Kent. His friends and his kinsmen sent him assurances of their readiness to rise whenever he should give the signal. It was not long delayed; in August Warwick directed his cousin Fitzhugh to stir up Yorkshire, as he had done a year before in the days of Robin of Redesdale. When King Edward heard that the Nevilles were up in arms, he came flying north with such forces as he could raise at short notice. Fitzhugh gave ground before him, and finally retired to the Border; the king pursued no farther than Ripon, for he had begun to suspect, and with truth, that the rising had been contrived with the sole purpose of drawing him away from London and the south coast. In September Warwick landed unopposed at Dartmouth, bringing with him not only his son-in-law Clarence, but a number of magnates of the Lancastrian faction, Jasper Tudor, Oxford, and others. They proclaimed Henry VI., and called on Devon and Somerset, old Lancastrian strongholds, to rise in their favour. In a few days they had 10,000 men under their banners, and were marching on London, meeting no resistance in any quarter. King Edward on hearing of Warwick's landing, had moved south from York with his army. Unknown to him, treachery was at work in its ranks; its chief agent was Warwick's brother, Montagu, who had professed loyalty, but was secretly in communication with the invaders, playing to the king the part that Clarence played to Warwick. On October 6, as the king lay near Nottingham, he was astounded to hear that a great part of his troops had deserted his banner,

CHAP. and that Montagu was leading them against him in the name
XVIII. of King Henry. So general was the disaffection that Edward fled with a following of no more than 800 men, including his young brother Richard of Gloucester, and the Lords Hastings, Say, and Scales. They seized shipping at Lynn and put to sea. Tossed by storms and pursued by Hanseatic pirates, they finally reached the coast of Holland, and threw themselves on the hospitality of Charles of Burgundy.

Within eleven days of his landing at Dartmouth Warwick was master of all England. He hastened to London, drew Henry VI. from the Tower, and enthroned him in St. Paul's. The spectacle was not an inspiring one; five years of captivity had broken and enfeebled the unhappy king. His reason, never very strong, was now permanently affected, and though he was not exactly insane, he was not in full possession of his faculties. He sat on his throne limp and helpless as a sack of wool, "a mere shadow and pretence of a king," and allowed his deliverer to deal with him as he pleased. Warwick's position seemed all that he could desire; at last he could rule the realm as the mayor of the palace to a puppet sovereign, and had not a monarch of the type of Edward IV. to thwart his desires. He declared himself and Clarence joint lieutenants of the realm, and chose the new ministry mainly from his own partisans, making his brother, George Neville, chancellor, and reappointing Langstrother treasurer, in place of Bishop Grey. But places were found for some of the Lancastrians. Jasper Tudor was made lieutenant for the king in Wales; Oxford became Constable of England. His first act on assuming that office was to try and condemn Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester. The "butcher-earl's" impaling of Warwick's captured retainers in the preceding spring had not been forgotten, and alone of all Edward's followers he was set aside for death. Meanwhile no harm was offered to Queen Elizabeth, who had taken refuge in the sanctuary of Westminster along with her little daughters. They remained in their refuge unmolested by the victors for more than six months.

Notwithstanding the completeness of the triumph of the cause of Lancaster there was mistrust between the old and the new followers of Henry VI. Queen Margaret refused to leave France, or to put her son in Warwick's power. Though he

wrote many times to request her prompt appearance, she lingered at Paris throughout the autumn and winter. Meanwhile the king-maker had taken up with vigour the policy of close alliance with France which he had always advocated. In November a treaty was made by which England engaged to aid Louis XI. in an attack on the Duke of Burgundy, and was promised part of the Netherlands as a reward. In December the French king commenced operations by seizing St. Quentin; an English contingent was to join him in the spring. Charles of Burgundy was forced to retaliate in the only way that was in his power; he rekindled the civil war in England by launching King Edward upon Warwick's flank. The Yorkist exiles were secretly collected in the Isle of Walcheren, ships were hired for their transport, and a considerable body of German mercenaries was lent to King Edward, as well as a sum of 50,000 gold crowns. Early in March, 1471, the expedition sailed from Flushing; the force was only some 1,200 strong, no great host with which to reconquer a whole realm. But Edward in 1471, like Warwick in 1470, had made sure of the help of traitors at home. His brother Clarence had intimated that he was still ready to turn against his father-in-law at the first opportunity. All the old Yorkists who were not of the Neville connexion, such as the Duke of Norfolk and the Bouchier family, were in the plot.

Warwick had been apprised of the coming invasion, and had taken his precautions against it. He had a fleet watching the Flemish coast, under his nephew the Bastard of Fauconberg. The Earl of Oxford had been sent into Norfolk, where he had arrested many suspected Yorkists. Montagu was in charge of the north, and had called out the retainers of the house of Neville. But a storm drove Fauconberg's squadron into harbour, and in the thick of it Edward set sail; he touched at Cromer, only to find that Oxford was guarding the coast of Norfolk too carefully to make it advisable for him to land there. Driving before the gale, he then made the Spurn Head, having resolved to come ashore in Holderness, a region which he thought might have been left unguarded because it had never been Yorkist in its sympathies. He was right; he disembarked unopposed at Ravenspur, the little port, now washed away by the encroachments of the North Sea, where

CHAP. Henry of Bolingbroke had landed in 1399. The country-
XVIII. side was hostile, but passing rapidly through it, Edward presented himself before the gates of York on March 18. He disarmed the opposition of the citizens by declaring that he had not come with any intention of claiming the crown, but simply to ask for his paternal inheritance, the duchy of York. He mounted a Lancastrian badge, and bade his troops cheer for King Henry. Finally, he was allowed to enter the city with sixteen followers only; there he assured the corporation of his pacific intentions, and persuaded them to feed and entertain his troops. Next day he plunged deep into the land; Montagu, with 4,000 men, had reached Tadcaster, with the intention of throwing himself across the invader's path. But Edward evaded him by a skilful flank march through Wakefield and Doncaster, and once more got upon the line of the London road. The marquis, whose generalship had been so bad as to cause suspicion of treason, pursued him day by day. But the adventurer was beginning to receive large reinforcements, Stanleys, Harringtons, Parrs, and other old adherents of the Yorkist cause joined him, each at the head of a powerful band. At Nottingham he felt himself strong enough to reassume the royal title.

Meanwhile hostile forces were converging from every corner of England. On hearing that Edward had eluded Montagu, the king-maker had handed over the charge of London and the king's person to his brother the chancellor, and had repaired to Warwick, to raise his own midland retainers. He had ordered up Oxford from the east, and had commissioned Somerset to make levies in the west, and the traitor Clarence to call out Gloucestershire and Wiltshire. All were to unite at some point south of Nottingham, where the invader's march could best be checked. Montagu, who was but two days' march behind Edward, would join the muster as best he could. But the skilful generalship of the Yorkist king foiled this combination. From Nottingham he turned against Oxford, the nearest of his enemies, who had reached Newark, with the Duke of Exeter and Lord Beaumont. The Lancastrians fell back eastward; Edward did not pursue; content to have thrust them away from their friends, he continued his march through Leicester towards Coventry, where Warwick had collected a small army.

On March 29 he appeared in front of its walls, and offered battle. But the earl, expecting to be joined in a few days by Clarence and Montagu, refused to come out to meet him. This gave Edward a fatal advantage; he slipped southward, and placed himself at Warwick, between the earl and London. This he did not merely to secure his way to the capital, but because he knew that Clarence was coming to join him, and not to reinforce his father-in-law. On April 3 the treacherous duke led his troops into the midst of the Yorkist army, and bade them "shout for King Edward". Betrayed by their leader they submitted to this unexpected transfer of their allegiance.

Meanwhile Oxford had reached Coventry, and Montagu was not far off; but Warwick was still too weak to fight. He rejected a proposal of mediation offered by Clarence, "crying that he thanked God that he was himself, and not that traitor duke," and kept himself safe behind the walls of Coventry, awaiting the arrival of his brother and the Yorkshire levies. This suited King Edward's designs well enough; when he saw that the earl would not fight, he made a forced march on London. On April 7 he was at Daventry, on the 10th he reached St. Albans a full day ahead of Warwick, who set out in pursuit the moment that he grasped the king's strategy. The forces of both sides grew rapidly as they toiled southward; Montagu and Somerset joined Warwick; simultaneously Edward received reinforcements from Essex and the eastern counties. On April 11 the Yorkists came before the gates of London; the chancellor tried to rouse the citizens to defend King Henry, assuring them that in two days his brother would be at hand to succour them. But he could only raise a few hundred men, and while he was vainly haranguing the Londoners some Yorkists opened Aldersgate, and admitted their master. Henry VI. was captured and replaced in the Tower, while Queen Elizabeth came out of her Westminster sanctuary, exhibiting with pride to her husband a son whom she had borne to him during her enforced seclusion—the future Edward V.

Meanwhile Warwick was at hand: the king was resolved to fight him, and sallied out of London on the 13th, strengthened by a considerable levy of citizens. The earl had taken post on

CHAP. the rising ground known as Gladsmoor Heath, above the town
XVIII. of Barnet, on the Great North Road. He had a good position along the crest of the hill, with the village of Monken Hadley beside his right wing and Wrotham Park in his rear. Edward, determined that his enemy should not slip away in the darkness, advanced his forces after nightfall, till they lay only a few hundred yards below the Lancastrian position. All night the artillery of each army played upon the spot where they believed the hostile lines to lie, but little harm was done on either side. The morning of the 14th was one of dense fog; neither party could well descry the other, and their fronts were not aligned exactly opposite. The king had taken the "main-battle" for himself, keeping the untrustworthy Clarence at his side, while his brother Gloucester took the right wing, and Hastings the left. In the rival host, Somerset had the centre post with his west-country troops, Warwick and his own midland retainers the left; the right was assigned to Oxford and Montagu with the Yorkshire and east-country levies. In the misty morning neither side had at first observed that the Lancastrian left far outflanked Hastings' division, while the Yorkist right overlapped Warwick's troops to the same extent.

When the clash of battle came, the king-maker, finding himself turned by Gloucester's men, had to throw back his wing and give ground somewhat. But Hastings, who was under similar disadvantages on the western end of the field, was not merely outflanked, but routed by Oxford's troops. His levies fled through Barnet, and carried to London the news that the battle was lost. Oxford, pursuing with reckless vigour, chased the fugitives for some distance and then turned back, but lost himself in the fog. Instead of coming in upon King Edward's rear, a movement which would have decided the day in Warwick's favour, he finally appeared behind Somerset and the Lancastrian centre. Mistaking his banner with the star of Vere for the Yorkist "sun with rays," Edward's device, Somerset's archers thought they were beset in the rear, and began to shoot at the new-comers. Finally each division recognised the other, but made the false conclusion that their fellows had deserted to the Yorkists. The cry of treason ran down the line, which was already hard pressed by King Edward, and it broke. Oxford and Somerset fled in different

directions, leaving Warwick and his men alone upon the field. The victorious Yorkists closed in upon them, and cut them to pieces; the great earl himself was slain in the flight, as he strove to get to his horse at the edge of Wrotham Park. With him fell his brother Montagu; the Duke of Exeter was wounded almost to the death, but carried off by his friends. The victor also had suffered heavily; on his side fell the Lords Say and Cromwell, and the heir of Lord Mountjoy. But the triumph could not be called dearly bought since Warwick was dead; if he had survived the cause of Lancaster might yet have been saved.

On the very day of the battle of Barnet Queen Margaret landed in England with her son, a few of her Lancastrian friends, Lord Wenlock, and Langstrother, the treasurer. These two magnates had been sent over in succession by Warwick to urge her to sail at once. But she lingered till it was too late, and, when at last she shipped herself at Honfleur, contrary winds beat her down the Channel. Her ships came ashore at different places between Portsmouth and Weymouth, at which she herself landed. Within three days arrived the news of Barnet, brought apparently by Somerset, who had rallied some wrecks of the beaten army, and gone off to the west, though Oxford and the relics of the Yorkshire levies of the Nevilles had fled to the north. Margaret was inclined to return to France; but her advisers persuaded her to make one more effort, pointing out that the strength of the Lancastrians of the west was unbroken, for few of them had come up in time for Barnet. Jasper Tudor also was in arms in Wales, and the Bastard of Fauconberg was in the Dover Straits with a great fleet, ready to make a descent on Kent and to distract King Edward's attention. Accordingly the queen issued an appeal to her adherents in Devon and Somerset, and pushed forward into the interior. She was soon at the head of a considerable force, but doubting the wisdom of an advance on London till every available friend had been rallied to her standard, resolved to move up the Severn towards Gloucester, and to call in Jasper Tudor's Welsh followers. While she was marching by Taunton and Wells on Bath, King Edward gathered his army at Windsor, uncertain at first whether she was moving on London or making for the Welsh border. Finding that she had chosen the latter course, he marched rapidly westward,

CHAP. hoping to intercept her somewhere in Gloucestershire. It was a
XVIII. question of hours whether he could do so or not, for on April 29 he was at Cirencester and she at Bath; but when on the next morning he advanced to Malmesbury, expecting to come upon the flank of her marching columns, he learnt that she had turned off to Bristol, to take the road along the vale of Berkeley and the Severn bank, instead of that over the crest of Cotswold.

The king swerved northward, and on the following day, May 1, was at Sodbury, where he discovered that the Lancastrians had got past him, and with a start of a few miles in their favour were making for Gloucester. He sent hasty messages to Richard Beauchamp, the governor of that place, to hold out for a few hours at all costs, and then started to march thither along the Cotswold ridge, where the road was better and the distance somewhat shorter than by the route in the valley which Margaret's army had taken. This day, May 2, was one of tremendous exertion for both armies—each marched more than forty miles, a great achievement on medieval roads. When the Lancastrians reached the gates of Gloucester, Beauchamp, despite the protests of many of the citizens, kept them closed and fired upon the queen's outriders. Seeing that it was impossible to cross at this point, Somerset urged on his tired troops towards the next bridge, that at Upton in Worcestershire. The army struggled as far as Tewkesbury, nine miles beyond Gloucester, and there encamped in a state of absolute exhaustion on the low slopes south of the town, in a position offering a strong line of defence, but having two defiles in its rear, the passage of the little river Swillgate immediately behind, and the Avon half a mile farther off. Both of these were bridged, but the broad Severn on their right hand was bridgeless and barely fordable. Edward meanwhile, descending from Cotswold into the plain at Cheltenham, pushed on five miles more that same evening, and encamped only three miles from the queen's army, so that it could not hope to withdraw across the bridges in its rear without a battle.

Retreat, however, was not Somerset's design. He had resolved to risk a battle, relying on the strength of his position with its "evil lanes, and deep dykes, hedges, trees, and bushes".¹

¹ *Arrival of King Edward*, p. 80. For an excellent account of the topography and tactics of Tewkesbury, see Canon Bazeley's monograph in the *Proceedings of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* for 1903.

He had arrayed his army in the normal three divisions along a slightly rising ground, a mile outside Tewkesbury town, in front of a farm called Gupshill, with the Swillgate covering his left, and a smaller brook on his right. Somerset himself had the "vaward battle"; in the centre was the young Prince Edward, with Lord Wenlock and Langstrother; the Earl of Devon was in charge of the "rearward," or left wing. The king had drawn up the Yorkists at dawn, in the same order as at Barnet, with Gloucester on the right, Hastings on the left, and himself and Clarence in the centre. He detached an ambush, or flank-guard, of 200 spears, fearing lest his left wing might be turned under cover of the trees of Tewkesbury Park, but this precaution turned out to be unnecessary. On arriving in front of the Lancastrian line, he found it so strong that he hesitated to attack, and bade his artillery and archers open at long range upon the enemy. Galled by this fire, or thinking that he had got the Yorkists at a disadvantage, Somerset left his position and charged furiously down upon the king, in the meadow now called the "Red Piece". He was not supported: both Wenlock and Devon refused to quit the strong ground which they held. The duke's sally had ruinous consequences; he was repulsed, attacked in flank by Edward's flank guard, and finally driven back up hill. The Yorkists burst into the hedges and dykes of the main Lancastrian position along with the fugitives. At the same time Gloucester delivered his attack on Devon on the other flank. The victory was won in a few minutes, and the whole Lancastrian force rolled back in rout towards the bridge, the town, and the fords of the Severn and Swillgate. Ere he fled, Somerset found time, it is said, to beat out the brains of Wenlock with his battle-axe, for failing to join in his wild charge into the Red Piece. The young Prince Edward was slain in the rout as he "cried for succour to his brother-in-law, the Duke of Clarence," and cried in vain.¹ With him fell the Earl of Devon, John Beaufort, brother of Somerset, and many more. The slaughter was continued along the "Bloody Meadow," on the left, and the fords of the Swill-

¹ Warkworth, p. 127. The story that he was not slain in the field but captured, and slain somewhat later by the king's order, after an altercation, appears to be a Tudor invention, designed to throw odium on Edward and his brothers. Gloucester and Clarence were accused of being the actual murderers.

CHAP. gate, on the right. Somerset, Langstrother, and many other
XVIII. knights took sanctuary in the abbey. The king had them
haled forth and tried on May 6 by a court, over which his
young brother Gloucester presided as constable, and the Duke
of Norfolk as marshal. Somerset and the treasurer with
some dozen others were beheaded, the men of less note were
spared. To complete Edward's triumph, Queen Margaret and
her daughter-in-law, Anne Neville, were captured next day in
a small religious house where they had taken refuge.¹

The cause of Lancaster was ruined by the death of Prince
Edward—there was no obvious heir to take his place: the
legitimate descendants of Henry IV. were extinct, save for the
poor prisoner in the Tower of London, and the male line of
the Beauforts was now extinct also; their house was represented
only by Lady Margaret, the widow of the Earl of Richmond,
and her young son Henry Tudor. It only remained that
King Edward should suppress the rebels of Wales and the
north, a task that seemed likely to present few difficulties. He
started northward, and was met at Coventry by the Earl of
Northumberland, who came to proffer the submission of the
lands beyond Trent, and to report that Oxford and a few other
desperate partisans of the lost cause had fled to Scotland. Yet
while Edward lay at Coventry he received disquieting news
from an unexpected quarter: London was in danger. The
Bastard of Fauconberg, having landed the crews of his fleet at
Sandwich, and called over the garrison of Calais, had raised the
Kentishmen to arms and made a dash at the capital. Kent had
always been loyal to the name of Warwick, and the Bastard had
a large following when on May 12 he assailed London Bridge
and tried to force his way into the city. It was held against him
by Edward's brother-in-law, Lord Rivers, who had been left
in charge, and by the local levies; but citizens seldom showed
much love for fighting during the Wars of the Roses, and Ed-
ward, dreading a disaster, started off at once to check Faucon-
berg. By the time that he arrived the danger was over. Though
the Kentishmen bombarded London from across the Thames,
and sent over detachments which vainly assaulted Aldgate
and Bishopsgate, they did not press the attack. The news of
Tewkesbury had broken their spirits; they drew off and dis-

¹ Perhaps Little Malvern Priory.

persed on May 18. The king reached London on the 21st; within a few hours of his arrival Henry VI. was dead. There is no reasonable doubt that he died a violent death; now that his son was gone, Edward IV. had no purpose to serve in keeping him alive. It was given out that he had died "of pure displeasure and melancholy," but it was generally known that the Duke of Gloucester had visited the Tower with his brother's mandate, and that Henry had died that same night. His corpse was exposed next day in St. Paul's, and buried at Chertsey with small state on May 24.¹

Of the poor remnants of the Lancastrian party, Fauconberg retreated to Sandwich and offered to surrender on receiving an amnesty, but failing to come to terms he put to sea, took to piracy, and was caught and executed a few months later; Jasper Tudor abandoned Wales, and fled over-seas, taking with him his young nephew the Earl of Richmond. After their departure the lands beyond the Severn settled down into quiet. Oxford escaped to France; subsidised and furnished with a few vessels by Louis XI. he performed in 1473 a most daring but objectless exploit. In September of that year, he surprised St. Michael's Mount in Cornwall, and held out there for some months. Beset both by sea and land, and starved out, he yielded on terms, but though his life was spared he spent the next ten years as a prisoner in the castle of Hanmes near Calais. The only other survivor of note from the Lancastrian party, the Duke of Exeter, had escaped from Barnet field badly wounded, and took sanctuary. The king, however, laid hands on him, and put him in the Tower, where he remained four years. Liberated in 1475, he was drowned in the Channel on his way to Calais, apparently without any suspicion of foul play. With him expired the male line of the house of Holland, a family which descended both from the brother of Edward II. and from the eldest daughter of John of Gaunt.

¹ There can be no doubt about the facts. The murder is plainly stated not merely by Tudor annalists but by contemporaries such as Warkworth (p. 131), the *London Chronicles* (ed. Kingsford, p. 133), Blackman, and the *Croyland Continuator* (p. 556).

CHAPTER XIX.

THE LATER YEARS OF EDWARD IV.

CHAP. BY June 1, 1471, Edward of York was once more seated firmly
XIX. upon his throne; he no longer ruled England because he was sustained by the house of Neville and upheld by the strong hand of the king-maker, but because he had won his crown by his own sword. He had proved himself a great soldier and a skilful and unscrupulous diplomatist. He was in the very prime of life; his thirtieth birthday had fallen six days before the battle of Tewkesbury, and his robust frame and splendid vitality gave promise of a long reign to come. Edward was able, high-handed, and self-willed: but it would appear that he was destitute of ambition, or lacking in that love of work for work's sake which a great king needs. He had a definite foreign policy, but he displayed it in a very spasmodic fashion. In domestic affairs he made no sweeping innovations, nor did he attempt to recast the institutions of the realm. He might have made himself an autocrat; his parliament and his people would have denied him nothing; the surviving baronage was powerless, the house of commons subservient, there was no longer any rival claimant to the crown who could have rallied the forces of discontent. But Edward either failed to see his opportunity, or refused to take it; he was content if he obtained his desires from time to time by means of the old forms, and did not obtrude his omnipotence upon the nation. It may be that he remembered the fate of Richard II., and understood that nothing is so dangerous to a king as the ostentatious display of his prerogative, but that arbitrary power may often be enjoyed in peace if no boast is made of it. It is, however, more probable that it was not from deep policy but from sheer indifference that he refrained from taking upon himself the state and the responsibilities of a

despotic king. He loved his ease; and though he could rouse himself when necessary to bursts of spasmodic activity, he detested hard work. It was enough for him that he could assert his will whenever he pleased; he could strike down any enemy, however highly placed, he could carry out any arbitrary measure, without let or hindrance. More he did not desire; hence, though he committed not a few acts of tyranny, he was never held a tyrant. It is by petty and systematic interference with the lives of their subjects, not by occasional outbursts of violence affecting only a few persons, that kings lose their thrones.

Seldom indeed has a prince displayed so little of the outward aspect of a tyrant as the first monarch of the house of York. A big, handsome, affable man, easy of access, and fond of his jest, he was well fitted to win the hearts of the multitude. Henry V. had been formal and austere; Henry VI. was a pious and unworldly recluse who could not comprehend, and could still less sympathise with, the ordinary business or pleasure of his subjects. Edward was fond of company of all sorts; he was as much at home among the citizens of London as among his barons; he shared all the common tastes of the day, and enjoyed a hunt, a dance, a pageant, an interminable banquet, with undisguised zest. He loved fine clothes, rich furniture, stately buildings, yet he never fell into extravagant recklessness of expenditure. "Albeit that all his reign he was with his people so benign, courteous, and familiar that no part of his virtues was more esteemed, yet nevertheless this quality at the end of his days marvellously in him grew and increased." Indeed, as one writer complains, "he bore himself homely among private persons, otherwise than the degree and dignity of his majesty required".¹ From such a ruler isolated acts of despotism were lightly borne; moreover they generally fell upon the baronial class whose misfortunes moved the burgher or the peasant but little. Yet, despite his jovial exterior, Edward could at times prove himself ungrateful, revengeful, and utterly destitute of pity. His private life was scandalous; never since John had England seen a sovereign who was such a notorious evil liver. His wife, a selfish and cold-hearted woman, seems to have shown a philosophic calm in bearing with his

¹ Hardyng's Continuator, p. 31, and Sir Thomas More's *Richard III.*, p. 150.

CHAP. XIX. countless amours. His mistresses were many, but none of them exercised any political influence; it is notable that the contemporary chroniclers make no personal reference to any one of them, save to Jane Shore, the wife of a London citizen, whose name is mainly remembered because of the preposterous charges of sorcery brought against her in 1485. Edward was not one of those kings who are ruled by women.

The years which immediately followed Barnet and Tewkesbury are almost destitute of history. It would seem that the king was content to rest awhile on his newly recovered throne. He replaced in office his old ministers of 1470, the Earl of Essex as treasurer, Bishop Stillington of Bath as chancellor, Bishop Rotherham of Rochester as privy seal. He signed truces with Scotland and with France, refusing to resent the part that Louis XI. had taken in the restoration of Henry VI. It is notable that he did not call a parliament till October, 1472, a full eighteen months after Tewkesbury; he felt himself too strong to require any reaffirmation to his title by the estates, and too wealthy to need any grants of money. For more than a year he lived contentedly on confiscations, and on "gifts" from the magnates who had bowed before Warwick and had to buy their pardon; many thousand pounds were obtained from the bishops alone. The king-maker's vast estates furnished ample plunder, and the temporalities of his brother the Archbishop of York were confiscated. Edward endowed his brothers Clarence and Gloucester with the greater part of Warwick's lands; Clarence, as the husband of Isabel Neville, was granted his father-in-law's lands in the south—the old Montagu and Beauchamp inheritance. Gloucester was given the North Riding estates, the original property of the younger branch of the Nevilles, with the great castles of Middleham and Sheriff-Hutton. Soon afterwards he married Anne Neville, the king-maker's younger daughter, and the widow of Edward, Prince of Wales. In her right he claimed a full half of Warwick's lands, to the indignation of Clarence, who had done his best to hinder the marriage.¹ The two brothers were at open discord in 1472, and the king

¹ It is even said that he kidnapped and concealed the Lady Anne in London, disguised as a kitchen-maid (*in habitu coquinario*), and that Gloucester discovered her hiding-place, put her in sanctuary, and then claimed her hand from the king (Croyland Continuator, p. 557).

had great difficulty in pacifying Duke George. Edward was naturally inclined to favour Gloucester, who had followed him faithfully through all his troubles and adventures, rather than the twice-perjured Clarence. He allowed the marriage to take place, and insisted on the dower rights of the Lady Anne, yet Clarence would seem to have kept a grasp upon the larger half of the Neville inheritance.¹ The feud between the two dukes was never healed; they appear as consistent enemies for the next seven years.

By the autumn of 1472, Edward had spent some £20,000 obtained from the men who had compromised themselves in the days of Warwick's ascendancy. He had also spent all the normal revenues of the crown, and was forced to make an appeal to parliament for further funds. The chancellor was sick, and the king's needs were set forth to the Commons by Bishop Alcock as his deputy. Edward announced that he had resolved to take up once more the ancient war with France, though he had signed a truce with King Louis no longer ago than the preceding summer, and that he required ample grants to enable him to levy an army in 1473. It is by no means certain that he had any real intention of engaging in a continental campaign at this moment, but he was aware that a French war was always popular, and that grants to maintain it were never grudged. On this occasion he was given a very liberal contribution; on the hypothesis that it was necessary to levy 13,000 archers, and to keep them under arms for a year, with pay at the rate of sixpence a day, the sum of £118,625 was required. This was to be collected not by the old method of fixed and unreal tenths and fifteenths, but by making a fresh inquiry into all existing incomes and property, so as to arrive at the real amount of every man's possessions. Special commissioners were to conduct the assessment, and to extract a tenth of every man's income: they were to keep the money apart from the ordinary revenue of the realm; it was to be spent only on the French expedition, and to be refunded if the army had not started before Michaelmas, 1474. This last

¹ The Countess of Warwick, the widow of the king-maker, was still alive in sanctuary. To her the Beauchamp and Despenser lands (though not the Neville and Montagu estates) really belonged. But her rights were disregarded, and her property was disposed of, as if she were already dead.

CHAP.
XIX.

proviso seems to show that the estates had grave doubts as to whether the armament would ever sail.¹

The project for the inquisitorial assessment of all private incomes would seem to have been most unpopular. In February, 1473, the houses reassembled, and on the allegation that the new tax was hard to raise, voted the king a tenth and a fifteenth of the old fictitious sort on account, while further arrangements were being made for the levying of the original grant. Meanwhile no signs were seen of preparations for the great invasion of France. Edward's foreign policy was moving in a very leisurely fashion. He had no intention of attacking Louis XI. single-handed; it was clearly to his interest to league himself with Charles of Burgundy, but his brother-in-law was the most erratic and unstable of statesmen. Heartily as the duke disliked his suzerain, the King of France, he never assailed him in a continuous and logical way. He was always being distracted by side-issues of German or Netherlandish politics, and his frequent declarations of war were invariably followed at no long interval by unexpected truces or peaces. In 1472, just as the English parliament assembled, Charles had concluded with Louis the truce of Senlis; it was perhaps the knowledge of this fact which made the Commons add conditions to their war-grant. In 1473 the duke was set on his great German adventure, and stretched out his hand towards the Rhineland. While he was endeavouring to bribe the Emperor Frederic III. to make him a king, he seemed to have forgotten his old designs upon France. Edward, if he had determined to carry out his invasion that year, would have had to do it alone. He had no such intention; indeed wise men abroad and at home doubted whether his ostentatious threats against France had any other purpose than to give him an excuse for raising money. No attempt was made in 1473 to levy the 13,000 archers of whom so much had been heard, and when parliament met again on January 20, 1474, it was informed that the invasion of France had been postponed, on account of the vacillations of the Duke of Burgundy. The Commons had been wise in securing that their money should

¹ Similar provisions, it will be remembered, had been made when the early parliaments of Richard II. granted their subsidies to the war-treasurers Philpot and Walworth. See above, p. 8.

not be expended unless an army had sailed before Michaelmas, 1474. Not a man had been raised or shipped by that date. Meanwhile the king had received and spent the tenth and the fifteenth granted him in February, 1473; he had also collected considerable sums by "benevolences," forced gifts extracted by fair words, that were backed by the unspoken threat of the royal displeasure against the recalcitrant capitalist who might turn a deaf ear to the request. The king took sums as low as £5, and did not disdain to bring his pressure to bear on yeomen and shopkeepers, no less than on knights and priors. By such means Edward made no war, yet kept his exchequer full. The only credit that can be ascribed to him is that he at least avoided debt. Unlike most of his predecessors, he seems to have paid his bills and discharged his borrowings with commendable punctuality.

There is little more to chronicle in the years from 1472 to 1474. There was a bad harvest and an outbreak of pestilence in the second summer, but the only domestic event that attracted the notice of contemporaries was the Earl of Oxford's wild adventure at St. Michael's Mount, which has been spoken of in another place.¹ More important in reality was a treaty with the Hanseatic league which most of the annalists of the time pass over in silence. There had been a long quarrel, dating back to 1468, between the English government and the "Easterlings". It had led to much piracy on both sides, and had resulted in the restriction of English trade to Germany and the Baltic. Edward, with his habitual disregard of prestige and care for practical advantage, signed a treaty in September, 1473, which surrendered his claims against the Hansa, and gave them leave to import their goods at the ancient customs-rates. Paying on this scale they had an advantage over other foreigners, and even in some respects over English traders. In February, 1474, he gave them an additional boon, the grant in perpetuity of their wharfs and houses of the Steelyard in Thames Street, and thus enlarged their factory into a complete *imperium in imperio*, governed by its own customs, and exempt from the jurisdiction of the municipality of London. Such a concession must have been most hateful to the native traders, but the king

¹ See above, p. 449.

CHAP. seems to have considered that the encouragement of trade with
XIX. northern and eastern Europe, even in foreign bottoms, was well worth the unpopularity which it entailed.

Meanwhile Charles of Burgundy had at last turned back to assail his old foe, Louis XI. As his German schemes began to show signs of failing, and new enemies were raised up against him on every side, he comprehended at last that he must deal with the crafty statesman whose diplomacy was the main cause of his checks, and he resolved to have Louis for an open, rather than a secret, enemy. His ambassadors appeared in London offering subsidies and military aid for any English army that should invade France. Edward thought the offer worth accepting, and on July 27 a treaty was signed by which Charles recognised his brother-in-law as lawful King of France, and undertook to aid him in recovering its crown, while in return Champagne, Bar, the Nivernais, Tournay, and certain other fiefs on the Burgundian frontier were to be ceded to him. It was covenanted that an English army of not less than 10,000 men, led by the king in person, should cross the Channel before July 1, 1475. Whether Edward had any real hope of repeating the exploits of Henry V. and getting himself crowned at Reims by Burgundian aid may be doubted, though he inserted in the treaty a special clause dealing with the proposed ceremony. He was well aware that the France of 1474 was not the France of 1415, and that, even with the assistance of his brother-in-law, he would find it a hard matter to overrun a realm which was now united as it had never been before, and was ruled by the most capable king that it had known since Philip the Fair. It is quite possible that he aimed at nothing more than getting himself bought off by cessions in Normandy or Guienne, or even by a handsome war indemnity. This was the view of the observant Commynes, who records his opinion that Edward was set on getting money from his subjects by proclaiming war, and then from his enemies by making peace.

Meanwhile Charles of Burgundy wasted the winter of 1474-75 and the spring that followed in the hopeless siege of Neuss. He only abandoned it on June 24, 1475, so that his whole field-army was far away on the Rhine when the English king landed at Calais on July 4. He had wasted untold wealth and

thousands of good soldiers on his German venture, and was not prepared to aid his allies when they appeared. Edward professed himself grievously disappointed. He had fulfilled his promise by raising an army of 11,000 men, well equipped, and handsomely provided with artillery and military stores. In addition, he had lent the duke a small separate contingent, which had sailed early in the spring under Lord Stanley and Sir William Parr: Charles had employed it in the siege of Neuss, where many of the men had perished. The main armament had been fitted out by the aid of grants made by a parliament called in January, which had commuted the unraised remainder of the unpopular income tax of 1472 for "a subsidy and three-quarters of a subsidy" levied on the older system of tenths and fifteenths.¹

Edward took with him his two brothers, who could only be kept from quarrelling when both were under the royal eye, the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, his stepson the Marquis of Dorset, the eldest child of Queen Elizabeth, the Earls of Northumberland, Arundel, Pembroke, Rivers, and Wiltshire, and about a dozen barons; he had somewhat over 9,000 archers, and no more than 1,200 lances—an unusually small proportion of "spears" to "bows" for an English army of the fifteenth century. The force was twice the strength of that which had won Agincourt, but it was not destined to perform even the smallest of exploits. On advancing from Calais Edward found that no Burgundian army was ready to co-operate with him, while the French were reported to be in great force beyond the Somme. Duke Charles made a flying visit to the camp, complained that the English had landed at Calais rather than in Normandy, and suggested that they should march towards Lorraine, where he would make shift to join them with the forces that he had drawn back from the siege of Neuss. Edward and his captains disliked the proposal; it seemed unwise to abandon their safe base at Calais, and to plunge deep into

¹ The income tax had never been fully raised: the peers had paid only £2,400, the commons £31,000, sums which were notoriously far below the real value of a tenth of all men's revenues. Nothing at all had been got from Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland, Durham, or Cheshire so late as the summer of 1474. The estates voted that £51,000 more should be levied on the property usually assessed for ordinary tenths and fifteenths, and when they reassembled in 1475 revoted the same sum in the shape mentioned above.

CHAP.
XIX.

the interior. Older English invasions had always been aimed at Paris or Normandy, and had not strayed far from the friendly sea. With great reluctance the king advanced as far as Peronne on the road towards the east; there further friction arose, for the Burgundian governor refused to admit the English within his walls. Finally the army moved on to St. Quentin, a place which the Count of St. Pol had promised to betray to the enemies of the King of France. He failed, however, to carry out his treacherous promise, and the invaders halted. At this crisis they were assailed by a temptation which proved too strong for Edward's virtue—if indeed he had not deliberately set himself in its way. The French king sent a secret emissary into his camp, with promises of liberal subsidies if he would desert his ally and lead his army home. Without hesitating even for a day, Edward announced his readiness to enter into negotiations. Louis would not cede an inch of territory, but made the most lavish offers of money; his cousin of England should receive a lump sum of 75,000 gold crowns (about £15,000) to assist him in the disbanding of his troops, and an annual pension of 50,000 gold crowns (about £10,000) for the term of his natural life. In addition the dauphin should marry the Lady Elizabeth, Edward's eldest daughter, who should be granted a handsome allowance till she reached marriageable years and came over to join her destined husband.

Charles of Burgundy heard of the plot, and came in haste to his ally's camp near Nesle on August 19. He taxed him to his face with treachery in the presence of the whole of the captains of the English host. Edward sullenly avowed his intentions, and recommended his brother-in-law to join in the treaty. But the duke assailed him with a storm of well-merited abuse, and then rode off to Cambrai, swearing that he would never look upon him again. Some of the king's counsellors, among them, it is said, his brother of Gloucester, expressed their sympathy with Charles's wrath and their shame at seeing him betrayed. But their master was not the man to be turned from his purpose by considerations of sentiment. He carried out the negotiations to their end, and on August 29 ratified the treaty at an interview with the French king held on the bridge of Picquigny, near Amiens. Louis flattered his late enemy in the most fulsome style, and distributed large gifts and bonds

for pensions among his principal followers. Gloucester, despite his late protests against the peace, did not disdain a handsome present of plate. The Chancellor Rotherham and Lords Hastings and Howard preferred cash. Perhaps the meanest feature of the whole sordid business was that Edward sold to Louis his unhappy prisoner Margaret of Anjou, for a sum of 50,000 crowns, in return for which the queen had to sign away to her liberator her claims to inherit her father René's dominions in Anjou, Provence, and Lorraine.

Having thus secured peace with profit, if not peace with honour, the king returned to England and disbanded his army. He had probably acted with solid wisdom in giving up the war: the days when successful invasions were possible had come to an end. Guienne, the one corner of France where the English rule had been popular, had settled down under its new masters during the last twenty years. Conquests in Picardy or Normandy could not have been held against a foe such as Louis XI. Charles of Burgundy had proved himself an unprofitable and reckless ally. Yet English public opinion was profoundly shocked at Edward's cynical repudiation of the pledges which he had made to his parliament and his people.¹ It was in vain that he spoke with pride of a permanent "tribute" to be received in future from the ancient enemy. All but his courtiers acknowledged that the French pension of £10,000 a year was a badge of shame and not of honour. It was regularly paid, and gave Edward appreciable help in keeping himself independent of parliamentary grants.

The treaty of Picquigny marks the turning-point in Edward's life and policy. Never again did he take the field in person, or lend himself to any adventurous scheme of conquest. For the rest of his reign he settled down to inglorious ease and enjoyment, varied by occasional acts of high-handed harshness. It is curious to note that, though bent on pleasure, he displayed a certain frugality in his administration. It seems to have been his main desire to avoid the summoning of parliaments, and to achieve the feat, in which so many of his predecessors had failed, of living on the normal revenues of the crown. These were swollen by confiscations, and appreciably increased by the French

¹ See especially the Croyland Continuator, p. 559.

CHAP.
XIX.

pension, yet it was no mean exercise of ingenuity to make them suffice for the royal expenses. Edward eked them out by divers mercantile ventures. He kept many ships like a private trader, and employed them in various lines of traffic, more especially in the exporting of wool, the most profitable of all merchandise at this time. He took advantage of his royal position to get good bargains from foreigners, to whom he could promise surreptitious advantages in England. But a still larger portion of his revenue came from the law courts. Professing a great zeal for justice, he was indefatigable in ferreting out small infractions of the laws, and exacting exorbitant fines for them. It is only fair to confess that after the troubles of the Wars of the Roses the arm of the law needed reinforcing, that riot, abduction, private wars, and blackmailing were so prevalent that in serving his financial ends the king was also serving the good governance of the realm. By one expedient and another Edward not only made his receipts cover his expenses, but accumulated a private hoard of treasure, of which he sometimes lent out a portion upon interest to persons who were in favour. To contrast his financial prosperity with the chronic bankruptcy of the Lancastrian exchequer, it may suffice to point out that between 1475 and 1483 he held but one parliament, and asked for no grants from that assembly, an extraordinary proof of his thrift.

For three years after the treaty of Picquigny the king summoned no parliaments, and made no wars. The only topic upon which the meagre chronicles of the time expatiate is his growing discontent with his brother Clarence. The duke was arrogant and presumptuous: he failed to perceive that his double treachery to his brother and his father-in-law in 1470-71 had marked him out as an object of suspicion for the rest of his natural life. Now that the king had male heirs—a second son named Richard had been born to him in 1473—he had grown more suspicious than ever of possible claimants to his crown, and seems to have been brooding over the fact that, according to the acts passed by the Lancastrian parliament of 1470, Clarence had succeeded to the rights of Henry VI. He had also become more jealous of his prerogative, and his brother kept irritating him by acts of high-handed presumption. An open breach was caused by an extraordinary invasion of the royal rights of justice by the duke in 1477. Clarence's wife Isabel Neville having died

suddenly, after childbirth, her husband declared that she had been poisoned by one of her attendants, a lady named Ankaret Twynhow, whom he carried off to Warwick Castle, where she was tried at a sort of petty sessions by certain justices of the peace, condemned and executed. Apparently at the same time one John Thuresby was hanged on the charge of poisoning the duke's infant son. State trials of such importance should, of course, have been conducted before the royal judges; the king sent down a writ to remove the venue to London, but found the prisoners already dead. He made no secret of his wrath; but his revenge took a curious shape; only a month after the execution at Warwick, several of Clarence's confidants were arrested on a charge of sorcery and treason. John Stacey, one of his chaplains, and Roger Burdett, a gentleman of his household, were accused of compassing the king's destruction, making astrological calculations concerning his death, and putting about seditious rumours and rhymes. They were condemned and hanged on May 20, 1477.

Instead of taking the hint, and reflecting that the next accusation might be brought against himself, Clarence publicly declared that his followers had been murdered, and even caused the protestation of innocence which they had made to their confessor before their execution to be read to the privy council. This reckless impeachment of the royal justice was more than the king could endure, but it would seem that his resolve to make an end of his brother was determined by other motives also. Charles of Burgundy, after the treaty of Picquigny, had turned aside to his war against the Duke of Lorraine and the Swiss, and had been slain at the battle of Nancy on January 5, 1477. His daughter Mary was left the richest heiress in Europe. Clarence, though his wife was but just dead, at once commenced to intrigue for the hand of the young duchess and enlisted the support of his sister Margaret, the widow of Charles. King Edward had expressly forbidden him to aspire to this marriage, and had lent his support to Maximilian of Austria, the suitor who was destined to be successful in the quest. Clarence, however, persisted in his intrigues, and, when they failed, turned off to another scheme equally offensive to his brother, a project for wedding Margaret, sister of James III. of Scotland. On discovering it, the king put a peremptory veto on the proposal. It

CHAP. seems probable that he was even more enraged by Clarence's
XIX. inveterate tendency to indulge in secret negotiation with foreign courts, than by his proceedings in the cases of Ankaret Twynhow, Stacey, and Burdett.

Be this as it may, the duke was sent to the Tower, and in the autumn a parliament was summoned to meet after the New Year, for no other purpose than his trial. In after years it was reported that Edward had been incited both by the queen and her relatives, and by the Duke of Gloucester, to destroy his brother; but there is ample evidence that he required no urging, and that the tragedy was of his own contriving. The two houses met on January 16, 1478: no grants were asked, no legislation of any importance laid before them. The whole of the short session of five weeks was devoted to the destruction of Clarence. The chancellor opened the proceedings by preaching on the text: "He beareth not the sword in vain". Then a bill of attainder was produced, setting forth the duke's misdeeds. It went back to his treasons of 1469 and 1470, though these had been pardoned long ago, but laid more stress on his conduct during the last two years. Clarence had usurped the royal prerogative of justice; he had called his brother the murderer of his subjects, and accused him of using necromancy; he had spread scandalous rumours that the king was a bastard.¹ His acts were as treasonable as his words; he had received oaths of allegiance from his retainers, binding them to follow him against any enemy that he might designate, had made preparations for an armed rising, and had displayed to his confidants the act of the Lancastrian parliament of 1470, which declared him heir to the crown in case of the death of Henry VI. and his son Edward. If this last allegation was true we cannot much wonder at the king's wrath, but no real proof of it was produced.

The proceedings before parliament were scandalous; when Clarence was produced the king railed at him in terms of unmeasured abuse, and the duke answered back in reckless defiance. The subservient lords and commons declared themselves satisfied of the prisoner's guilt, and passed the bill of attainder. Sentence

¹ Alluding to a silly tale that the Duchess of York had been seduced by an archer named Blackburn. Charles of Burgundy in his wrath before Picquigny is said by Communes (vol. i., pp. 356-59) to have used the taunt. Richard of Gloucester alluded to it in his preposterous claim to the crown in 1483.

was then passed on him by a court over which the young Duke of Buckingham presided as lord steward. The king made some show of hesitation as to sending his brother to the block, whereupon the house of commons exhibited a petition, urging that for his own security, for the defence of the Church, and for the public good, he was bound to let justice prevail over mercy. On February 17 it was announced that Clarence was dead; he perished in the Tower, no man knew how, "but whatever was the manner of it, justice was executed upon him".¹ A wild story, which can be traced back almost to the moment of his death, told that he was drowned in a butt of Malmsey wine: was he perchance poisoned in a draught of that liquor? ² The duke having been condemned, parliament reversed the sentence on Ankaret Twynhow, and repealed the act of succession of 1470, which Clarence had so unwisely displayed. His estates were retained in the king's hands, save that some small gifts were made to Gloucester and Rivers. His two infant children, Edward (afterwards styled Earl of Warwick) and Margaret, were given in wardship to the Marquis of Dorset, the eldest son of Queen Elizabeth. The only other proceedings in this parliament which merits a word of notice, was the settling of the whole of the estates of the great duchy of Norfolk on the king's second son Richard. John, the last Mowbray duke, had died in 1475, leaving an only daughter of tender years: she was betrothed to the little prince, and the whole Norfolk inheritance was entailed on them and their issue.

Edward had only five years to live after the execution of his brother. His health began to fail about this time, and he grew corpulent and lethargic. He was not yet forty years of age, yet obviously he was long past his prime; contemporary English public opinion ascribed his decline to systematic evil living and self-indulgence, and rumour was probably correct. His right-hand man and chief councillor in these years was his brother Richard of Gloucester, whose faithful service from his youth up had won the admiration of the whole Yorkist party. Gloucester had the reputation of a staid and religious man, yet possessed enough of the arts of popularity to make himself much beloved in the north country, where, owing to the immense

¹ Croyland Continuator, p. 562.

² It is given by Commynes and the *London Chronicles* (ed. Kingsford, p. 188).

CHAP.
XIX.

heritage of his wife Anne Neville, he was the greatest landowner in Yorkshire. Nothing that he ever did in King Edward's time gives countenance to his reputation for gratuitous and malevolent wickedness. He seemed to be destitute of personal ambition, and desirous only of serving his brother to the best of his powers as general, councillor, and administrator. After Richard of Gloucester, the persons who had most influence at Edward's court were his wife's relatives, her brothers Anthony, Lord Rivers, Richard and Edward Woodville, her sons Dorset and Richard Grey. Outside this family circle, the king's chief favourites were the Lords Hastings and Stanley, men whom he had himself raised to wealth and power, and who had shared in all his adventures. Of the elder nobility, since the house of Norfolk had died out, the chief survivors were the Dukes of Suffolk and Buckingham and the Earl of Northumberland, all three men whose predecessors had fallen in the service of the house of Lancaster, but who had escaped death or confiscation because they had been children at the moment. They seemed to have accepted the new dynasty without reserve; Suffolk had married the king's sister; Northumberland had pacified the north in 1471; Buckingham had consented to preside over the tribunal which passed the sentence of death on George of Clarence.

The state of continental affairs in the years that followed the death of Charles the Bold at Nancy would have given the king ample opportunities for interference. But whether it was that he loved his French tribute of £10,000 a year too well to imperil it, or that he wished to avoid coming before parliament with requests for subsidies, Edward maintained a strict neutrality. He signed a commercial treaty with the young Duchess of Burgundy and her husband Maximilian of Austria, but would not ally himself with them against his paymaster Louis of France. It is probable that this reluctance to engage in the continental struggle was partly due to the king's desire to take up the less ambitious scheme of an intervention in Scottish affairs. James III., the weakest and most unfortunate of all the luckless Stewarts, was troubled by the intrigues of his brother, Alexander Duke of Albany, and of James Earl of Douglas, both of whom were at this moment in exile in consequence of their treasonable plots. The whole nobility of Scotland were known

to be chafing against the rule of the low-born favourites to whom the king had given his confidence. Edward seems to have considered that the opportunity was favourable for claiming once more the old suzerainty over Scotland, and for recovering Berwick, which had remained in the hands of the Stewarts ever since Margaret of Anjou surrendered it in 1461. Either James III., conscious of the insecurity of his throne, would make every concession demanded of him, or Albany and his friends would promise homage and submission, in return for armed assistance against the king.

CHAP.
XIX.

In the spring of 1480 Edward made use of the fact that Scottish raiding parties had been harrying Northumberland to begin diplomatic pressure on his neighbour. The King of Scots vainly sought help from Louis XI., and sent an embassy to London; it met with no success, since the English government was set on war. Meanwhile Edward summoned no parliament and asked for no grants, but procured money for war expenses partly by levying benevolences, partly by calling up arrears of the old taxation of 1474, which had not yet been exacted. Hostilities began in April, 1481, when an English fleet sailed up the coast of Lothian and Fife, and captured or destroyed many merchant vessels. On land, for reasons which we cannot fathom, nothing decisive was done in this year; an army was levied, but it started late and accomplished little save some trifling incursions into Teviotdale and the Merse. Probably Edward was deferring his main blow, in order to see if he could scare James III. into complete submission. It was only when his enemy remained feebly recalcitrant that the English king committed himself to the cause of the Scottish rebels. In the spring of 1482 he sent to Paris for the exiled Duke of Albany, who came over to London and signed at Fotheringhay, on June 10, a treaty in which he bound himself, if placed on his brother's throne by English aid, to do homage to Edward as his suzerain, surrender Berwick, Eskdale, and Annandale to him, and marry his third daughter Cecilia, a girl of thirteen.

Seven days later Albany was at York, where the Duke of Gloucester was assembling an army; the king was no longer able or willing to take the field in person. The troops were levied by the economical but unsatisfactory device of calling upon the shires and boroughs to provide contingents at their

CHAP. own expense. For this procedure in the case of a Scottish war
XIX. there were plenty of ancient precedents. On July 15 the two dukes marched out from York with an army of some 10,000 men, and advanced on Berwick to which they laid siege. The King of Scots called out the whole feudal force of his realm to resist the invaders, but when he had reached Lauder in the Merse his barons rose against him. Headed by the celebrated Archibald, "Bell the Cat," Earl of Angus,¹ they seized and hanged the king's favourites, sent James himself a prisoner to Edinburgh Castle, and then opened negotiations with Albany and his allies. Gloucester wished to exact the surrender of Berwick as an indispensable preliminary to any suspension of arms. This the Scots refused, and the siege went on, but the communication between the hostile camps went on also, and Albany was won over by his friends to give up his pretensions to the crown. He was promised the restitution of his dignity and his estates, and the chief place in his brother's council, when he should return to his allegiance. This move on the part of the duke foiled Edward's scheme for placing him on the Scottish throne as a vassal of the English crown. But in other respects the Scots offered favourable terms; Berwick should be surrendered and the eldest son of King James should marry the Lady Cecilia. Edward, somewhat grudgingly, closed with this offer, whose acceptance was recommended by Gloucester. It would have been unwise to persist in the war when the Scottish factions were reconciled; the recovery of Berwick was a solid gain; the suzerainty over the northern realm was a phantom, often pursued but never secured since the days of Edward I. With his wonted preference for practical results and distrust of great designs, Edward refused to spend money or lives in continuing the struggle.

Gloucester and Albany entered Edinburgh in triumph on August 3, and when the treaty had been drafted the English army departed, receiving the surrender of Berwick on its homeward way. Gloucester was considered to have added to his reputation both as soldier and as diplomatist during this short campaign. He was certainly one of the few invaders who

¹ It was on this occasion that Angus won his nickname by relating to the barons the fable of the mice and the cat, and undertaking himself to execute the dangerous enterprise of seizing and slaying Cochrane and the other minions of James III.

brought home from Scotland an intact army and a satisfactory peace. James III. was released from captivity a month later, Albany being made lieutenant of the realm. Yet, within eight months of the treaty of Edinburgh, the duke had repented of his moderation in taking the second place when he might have grasped at the first. Early in 1483 he renewed his intrigues with the English court, and besought King Edward's assistance in seizing the Scottish crown. His petition was accepted, and a secret agreement was signed on February 11, by which Albany bound himself to acknowledge the English supremacy when he should become king, and Edward guaranteed him the aid of an army under the command of Gloucester. But before Duke Alexander's treason could be consummated the English king was dead, and since Gloucester had other matters in hand during the spring and summer of 1483, the plot came to nothing, and the would-be usurper was expelled by the Scottish nobles when his designs were discovered.

It seems probable that Edward brought the Scottish war to an abrupt conclusion, and accepted the compromise which gave him no more than the possession of Berwick, because he saw troubles at hand on the continent. He had now been receiving his French pension for seven years with great regularity, but King Louis was showing signs of an intention to repudiate the other clauses of the treaty of Picquigny. The time had arrived at which the dauphin ought to have married the Lady Elizabeth, who had now reached the age of sixteen. Louis delayed the completion of the matter, having by this time discovered a more profitable match for his son. The Duchess Mary of Burgundy had died on March 27, 1482, leaving her estates to the care of her husband Maximilian, as the guardian of her children. The King of France offered to wed his son to Margaret, Mary's only daughter, and to accept as her dowry his late conquests from the heritage of Charles the Bold—the duchy of Burgundy, Artois, and the rest. This device would legalise his position in the conquered lands, and would spare Maximilian the necessity of finding another dowry for his daughter. At first the archduke was inclined to refuse the offer; but the estates of Flanders and Brabant brought such pressure to bear upon him that he yielded and accepted the bargain, which was avowed in November, 1482. The

CHAP.
XIX.

open repudiation of the match between his daughter and the dauphin seems to have touched King Edward to the quick, and he showed more heat and anger over the matter than Louis XI. had expected. He was afraid that his much-cherished pension would disappear, now that Louis was reconciled to the house of Burgundy, and had nothing more to fear from English intervention.

Accordingly a parliament was summoned for January 20, 1483, to hear the king's complaints against his treacherous neighbour. It was the first time since the death of Clarence that the estates of the realm had met. It would seem that the king took the renewal of the struggle with Louis into serious contemplation. The misdoings of the French government were set forth to the houses, who voted a tenth and a fifteenth "for the defence of the realm," enough for preparations though not enough for actual war. Edward also suggested, or agreed to, an act of resumption, whereby much alienated property of the crown was taken back into the royal hands, to the profit of the exchequer. But, as usual, exceptions were made in favour of the Duke of Gloucester, the queen's relatives, and other persons with interest at court, so that the net sum reclaimed was probably not very large. Edward also consented to accept an assignment of £11,000 a year for the expenses of his household, a sum so moderate that he must clearly have been anxious to set as much money free for military purposes as could be managed. The Commons were allowed, in return for their liberality, to pass acts dealing with matters of trade, livery and maintenance, and the preservation of the domestic peace of the realm. The king was set on conciliating every class of his subjects in view of the oncoming war.

Whether Edward intended to push matters to a rupture, or would have consented to a compromise, if only the French king would guarantee the continuance of his pension, we shall never know. For, a few weeks after parliament had been prorogued, his health, which had been unsatisfactory for several years, showed a sharp turn for the worse. On March 30, 1483, he took to his bed, and ten days later he was dead. The French chroniclers ascribe his end to anger and excitement about the proposed war, acting on an enfeebled constitution. English writers simply state that he was killed by a long-continued

course of luxury and loose living. The one explanation does not exclude the other. He had not yet completed his forty-first year, and had certainly not worn himself out by exertion or overwork. Since the treaty of Picquigny he had deliberately taken his ease, handing over all the routine of government to his ministers, and all important administrative matters to his brother Gloucester. He rusted away in inglorious ease and self-indulgence, only rousing himself on rare occasions for a burst of wrath, such as that in which he made away with Clarence, or his final outbreak against King Louis. He might have been a tyrant; he preferred to be a voluptuary. England has had many worse kings, though she has seldom been ruled by a worse man than the selfish, ruthless, treacherous Edward of Rouen.

It is only fair to state the little that may be said in his favour. He was as intelligent as he was idle and selfish. Indeed in many respects his character much resembled that of Charles II.: like his descendant he was determined "not to go on his travels again," and therefore he refrained from provoking the nation. He was, as we have seen, not unthrifty. He made some attempt to maintain administrative order in the realm, and to enforce the laws. He encouraged trade and commerce, and was a patron, on a modest scale, of architecture, art, and letters. The £20 that he gave to Caxton must be allowed to plead in his favour. The one redeeming feature of his worthless and immoral court was its addiction to literature. The small beginnings of the English Renaissance may go back to Humphrey of Gloucester, who loved the classics, collected a large library, and corresponded with continental scholars. But most of the favourites of Edward IV. seem to have had some tincture of learning. Tiptoft, the "butcher-earl," had studied at Padua, and was reckoned a man of vast erudition. "In his time" wrote Caxton, "flowered in virtue and cunning none like him, among the lords of the temporality in science and moral virtue. . . . The axe (that slew him) at one blow cut off more learning than was left in the heads of all the surviving nobility." He translated books of Cicero and Cæsar, besides composing works of his own both in Latin and English. Anthony, Earl Rivers, the Queen's brother, made several renderings from the French, was a poet of some merit, and a great patron of Caxton, whose first London-printed book, the *Dictes or Sayings of the Philo-*

CHAP.
XIX.

sophers, he had translated ; the earl and the printer together laid it before the king in 1477. The Earls of Arundel and Essex, Hastings, and even the saturnine Richard of Gloucester himself, were all friends of learning. The best proof of a general and growing interest in letters is that when Caxton (after printing a book or two at Bruges) set up his press at Westminster, he found a public which could buy editions of no less than thirty different books produced in three years. Some of these were solid tomes like Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* of 700 pages, and the *English Chronicle* of 364 pages.

It is curious to find that the Church is decidedly less prominent than the court in the new intellectual movement: though names like that of Bishop Grey of Ely may be quoted among its patrons, yet the first men of the English Renaissance were mostly from the laity. The intellectual vigour of the clerical body was declining, as is shown by the ceasing of the monastic chronicles, and the rareness of controversial literature. Even the energy to harry Lollards was dying away, though one John Goos was burnt in 1474, and one or two other "heretics" suffered under Edward IV. We are at the sorry end of the Middle Ages in religious if not in intellectual matters.

CHAPTER XX.

THE FALL OF THE HOUSE OF YORK.

THE situation of affairs at the death of Edward IV. bears a close resemblance to that which had occurred 106 years before at the death of Edward III. Once more the crown was left to a boy-king; Edward Prince of Wales was now twelve years of age, two years older than Richard II. had been at his accession. In each case the king's mother—Joan of Kent in 1377, Elizabeth Woodville in 1483—had been a widow when she made her royal marriage, and had a family by her first husband, who were therefore the nearest relatives of the young sovereign; the Greys stood to Edward V. just as the Hollands stood to Richard II. Moreover, in each case the king's mother and her relatives were on somewhat strained terms with the prince who had been the chief councillor and second self of the lately deceased sovereign. John of Gaunt's position had been precisely the same as that which Richard of Gloucester now occupied. Each of them was tempted for the same reasons to aspire to a regency or protectorate. If the young king were kept completely under the control of his mother and her party, his uncle would be deprived of the power and influence which he had enjoyed of late, and would run some chance of suffering even worse things. Yet it would seem difficult for him to dream of more than a regency, for in each case several lives stood between him and the crown. In 1377 the descendants of Lionel of Clarence were before Lancaster in the line of succession; in 1483 there was not only the boy-king to be considered, but all the other children of Edward IV., his second son Richard of York and his five surviving daughters.

It must, however, be noted that the position of Richard of Gloucester was in many respects stronger than that of John of

CHAP.
XX.

CHAP. Lancaster. His past record was far better: he had a well-
XX. merited reputation for ability both as an administrator and a general, while Lancaster had failed in everything to which he had put his hand. Elizabeth Woodville and her greedy brothers and sons were unpopular in the extreme; Joan of Kent had been universally esteemed. In 1377 too the English baronage was still strong and numerous: there were many great lords who would have sided with the Earl of March and the other leaders of the constitutional party, if Lancaster had made an attempt at usurpation. In 1483 the old baronage had almost perished; the house of lords of Edward IV. was mainly composed of adventurers recently elevated to greatness, and completely dependent on the crown. Moreover, the last years of Edward III. had been a time of great parliamentary activity: the nation was embittered against the government, and had been contending not unsuccessfully with it. Edward IV. had almost made an end of parliaments; he had called but two in nine years, and both of them had met merely to learn and to carry out his behests. In 1377 England was a constitutional monarchy, in 1483 it had almost become a despotism.

Yet, when all is said, the main difference between the position of John of Gaunt and that of Richard of Gloucester, was that the one was, despite of all his faults, a loyal knight, ready to sacrifice his ambitions to his sense of honour and duty; the other was perfectly unscrupulous, and ready to wade through any depth of bloodshed to the crown which lay within his grasp. They were typical men of their times; the fourteenth century still retained the ideals of chivalry, however it might sin against them. The fifteenth century was thoroughly demoralised; it had lost all touch with chivalry, religion, and loyalty in the ruthless Wars of the Roses. Gloucester had long been the faithful servant of his brother; he passed as a staid and pious prince; probably he would never have lost his reputation, if Edward IV. had lived to see the length of years of Edward III. But when temptation came he showed himself destitute of the elements of common morality, the worthy compeer of any of the Viscontis or Sforzas of Italy, the true descendant of Pedro the Cruel of Castile.¹ Later generations represented

¹ It must never be forgotten that the whole house of York descended from King Pedro, through his younger daughter, who married Edmund of Langley, the first duke, and the patriarch of the White Rose.

him as a monster both in body and mind. In Tudor tradition he is almost a dwarf, with a crooked back, a withered arm, and a face of fiendish malignity. This is gross exaggeration, but there seems no doubt that he was below the common stature, and that his left shoulder was lower than his right, owing to some weakness on his left side. The deformity was not sufficient to prevent him from bearing arms; he was indeed a notable fighting man. Several contemporary portraits of Richard exist; they show a thin, melancholy, suspicious countenance, contrasting in a marked fashion with the burly Edward IV. But many better men have had a more forbidding face: nature had not set upon him any stamp to warn mankind against a villain. He would seem to have been of the nervous and emotional, rather than of the brutal and callous, type of criminal. There are reasons for supposing that he was not destitute of a conscience, and that it sometimes plagued him. But when strung up to the perpetration of a crime, he could carry it out with careful and deliberate completeness. The policy of the next two months could not have been conducted to a successful end save by one who could, when it was needful, exercise an iron self-control.

The late king had died so suddenly that he had not been able to make proper arrangements for the government of the realm under his son. It was clear that a regency or protectorate would be necessary, and that the only possible candidates for the post of temporary head of the state would be the queen and the Duke of Gloucester. Elizabeth could count on the support of her own family alone; she and they were detested alike by the remnants of the baronage and by the nation at large. But they had the inestimable advantage of being in possession of the person of Edward V., who was at Ludlow, the old centre of the York heritage in the march of Wales, in the charge of his uncle, Earl Rivers, and his half-brother, Sir Richard Grey. Gloucester was in the north, busy no doubt with the projected interference in Scotland on behalf of the Duke of Albany. The queen was in London with her elder son, the Marquis of Dorset, and the ministers—the chancellor, Rotherham, and the privy seal, Russell, Bishop of Lincoln. The treasurer, Bouchier, Earl of Essex, the other chief official of the realm, had chanced to die a few days before the king. If Elizabeth had possessed the

CHAP.
XX.

energy of Margaret of Anjou, she might have brought her young son up to the capital, with all the levies of the march at his back, and have defied her enemies. But she knew her own unpopularity, and was cowed by the attitude of the lords of the council, led by Hastings, Stanley, and Howard, who showed themselves openly hostile to her when once her husband was in his grave. There was a pause for three weeks, during which each party was counting up its strength. At last it was announced that the young king was coming to London to be crowned; as the result of a compromise between the queen and the council he was to be escorted by no more than 2,000 men, under the command of his kinsmen, Rivers and Grey. All the magnates of England set their faces towards the capital to meet him there.

The king and his escort moved by way of Shrewsbury and Northampton, and were at Stony Stratford when it was reported to them that the Dukes of Gloucester and Buckingham, coming from the north, were only ten miles behind them on the road. Rivers and his nephew, suspecting no evil, turned back to greet the dukes, after seeing the king safely installed in his lodging. Gloucester gave them a polite welcome that night, but next morning assumed a different countenance, declared that they were conspiring to estrange him from the king, and arrested them both. He then rode on to Stony Stratford, seized Sir Thomas Vaughan and Sir Richard Hawte, the leaders of the king's retinue, and ordered the retainers from the march who had guarded his nephew to disperse. They obeyed, being left without a commander to guide them. The duke then sent Rivers and his three companions as prisoners to Yorkshire, and took charge of the person of the king, who wept bitterly and kept asserting that he could vouch for the loyalty of his good uncle Anthony. When the news of this *coup-de-main* reached London, the queen, abandoning all thoughts of resistance, took sanctuary at Westminster with her younger son, Richard of York, and her five daughters. Her brother, Sir Edward Woodville, and the Marquis of Dorset fled to sea with a few ships of the royal navy, whose crews were in their interest. On the whole Gloucester's action was not unpopular; the queen's relatives were disliked, and no one suspected the duke of aiming at more than the position of regent. The lords of the council

welcomed him when he brought the young king to town on May 4, and a few days later acknowledged him as protector and "defender of the realm".

CHAP.
XX.

The position of affairs between May 4 and June 13 was threatening and enigmatical. At first it was generally believed that all would go well; a parliament was summoned, and it was announced that the coronation of Edward V. would take place on June 22. But presently the conduct of the protector began to give cause for serious misgivings among loyal adherents of the house of York. He shut the king up in the Tower¹ and refused to allow free access to his person. He dismissed the chancellor, Archbishop Rotherham, who had served as the chief minister of Edward IV. for the last nine years. He called up enormous levies of his Yorkshire retainers, and he was in continual secret conference with certain of the greater lords, for ends that could not be divined. For, being completely master of the situation, he had no excuse for displaying military force, or making private leagues with the magnates, unless he had some sinister intention. The fact was that Richard's ambition soared beyond a protectorate, which could only last some four or five years; he knew that his young nephew detested him and was deeply attached to his mother and his uncles. He had begun to contemplate a usurpation. It is improbable that the idea entered into his mind before he had triumphed over the Woodvilles and installed himself in power. Tudor annalists alleged that he had always been a schemer, that he had been responsible for the estrangement of Clarence from Edward IV., that he had encouraged his brother in all his evil courses, and had been making himself friends in the north for many years with treasonable designs in view. All of this is not only unprovable but impossible; no one could have foreseen that the late king would have died at the age of forty-one; if he had lived till fifty there would have been no career of usurpation open to the duke.

But surveying the state of the court and the nation in May, 1483, and looking forward a few years to his nephew's majority, Gloucester was tempted to turn the present crisis to his own advantage. England, as he thought, was ready to accept any government that promised quiet times, good justice, and light

¹ Apparently on May 19,

CHAP. taxation. The old instinctive loyalty to the crown had been
XX. killed by the constant vicissitudes of the Wars of the Roses. The baronage was partly demoralised, partly powerless; the Church had lost much of her influence as a moral power; the Commons would acquiesce in almost anything. Even the deposition of the young king might be tolerated, if only the matter were judiciously handled. The sole difficulty would be with a few of the greater peers and with the lords of the council. Gloucester, therefore, set himself to sound the more important personages; he had already bought over to his side the Duke of Buckingham, the greatest surviving territorial magnate, and the representative of the line of Thomas of Woodstock. This ambitious and unscrupulous young man, who had first won notoriety by passing sentence on Clarence in 1478, had been with him at the arrest of Rivers and Grey, and was ready to follow him to any lengths. He acted as his go-between in all the intrigues of May and June, and had already begun to receive payment for his services. He was made justiciar of North and South Wales, and constable of all the royal castles both of the principality and the marches, before the protector had been many days in power.

Another peer who was bought early was Lord Howard, who had his eye on the duchy of Norfolk. The little heiress of the Mowbray dukes, who had been betrothed to Richard of York, had lately died, and by the parliamentary settlement of 1478 her vast estates went to the young prince. But Howard's mother was one of the next of kin, and, as a true representative of the Mowbrays, he looked upon the alienation of their property to the royal house as a monstrous injustice. A hint that, if the sons of Edward IV. were removed, the duchy of Norfolk might go to the rightful heir sufficed to secure him. His appointment as steward of the duchy of Lancaster probably marks the sealing of the bargain. The protector would also seem to have won over the Duke of Suffolk, a man of no personal importance, but the only duke save Buckingham, Gloucester himself, and the boy York, who then survived. Grants of places of power or emolument were made about the same time to the Earls of Northumberland and Arundel, the Lords Lovel and Dynham, and several others. But how far such persons were admitted to the private councils of Gloucester and Buckingham is doubtful. On the

other hand, certain of the lords of the council seem to have met the cautious overtures of the protector in such a fashion that he saw that they could not be won over. Hastings, the chief confidant of the late king, was heard to declare that, if he had suspected what was on hand, he would have adhered to the queen's faction a month before, though he was the deadly enemy of her son, Dorset. Other councillors who were not to be bribed were the late chancellor, Rotherham, Morton Bishop of Ely, and Lord Stanley. Before taking any further steps the protector resolved to rid himself of these men of inconvenient honesty.

On June 13 a council was being held in the Tower; the meeting included those who were in the way of Richard's schemes. After some preliminary conversation of a pleasant and bantering sort, the duke withdrew for a moment, and returned with a band of armed men, whom he left at the door. Reseating himself he assumed a fierce and lowering countenance, and suddenly asked Hastings what punishment was deserved by persons who were compassing the death of one so near in blood as himself to the king, of one who also was protector of the realm. Hastings—unsuspicious of what was to come—replied that they deserved the worst. "It is that sorceress, my brother's wife," replied Richard, "and Shore's wife, and others with them; behold what they have done to me with their witchcraft." So saying he bared his left arm and showed it shrunk and withered—which, says the narrator of this strange incident, it had been since his earliest years.¹ The mention of Jane Shore terrified Hastings, for since his master's death he had taken under his protection that witty and attractive person. To accuse his mistress of sorcery was to strike at himself. But he murmured, "Certainly, my lord, if they have done so heinously, they are worthy of heinous punishment". Gloucester, affecting furious wrath, shouted: "Dost thou serve me with 'ifs' and with 'ans'? I tell thee they have done it, and that I will make good on thy body, traitor." Thereupon he smote loudly on the table, and at the signal his armed satellites burst into the room. They arrested Hastings, Archbishop Rotherham, Bishop Morton, and Lord Stanley, who was wounded on the head with a pole-axe in the scuffle. Hastings, without any form of trial, was hurried

¹ All this, of course, is drawn from Sir Thomas More's *History of Richard III.*: he was told the story by Morton, an eye-witness.

CHAP. down into the courtyard and beheaded on a log of wood, being
XX. barely allowed time to confess himself to the first priest that could be found. The other three councillors were thrown into prison: Stanley and Rotherham made their peace with the protector and were liberated after no long detention; Morton remained in bonds.

This cruel murder of a man whom all knew to be loyal cowed Gloucester's enemies, but at the same time revealed the fact that he must have some sinister plot in hand. The whole of London was in confusion, but no riots took place, for northern levies were flocking into the city by thousands, and no man dared even to raise his voice. Three days later Gloucester went to Westminster with a large armed retinue, and terrified the queen into surrendering her second son, Richard. The aged Archbishop Bouchier, and Bishop Russell, the new chancellor, pledged their words to Elizabeth that her son would be in no danger with his brother in the Tower. No doubt they were sincere in their protestations; but they little knew the protector's mind, or suspected the infamies of which he was capable. When both his nephews were in his power, Richard began to show his true intent. Six days after the Duke of York had been imprisoned the first definite step was taken: on June 22 a certain Dr. Shaw, brother of the Mayor of London, was put up to preach at St. Paul's Cross a political sermon, for which he took as his text a passage from the Book of Wisdom (iv. 3), *Spuria vitulamina non agent radices altas*, "bastard slips shall take no deep root," and broached to the astonished citizens the theory that King Edward's children were all illegitimate. Before his marriage with Elizabeth Woodville he had been precontracted to Lady Eleanor Talbot, daughter of the Earl of Shrewsbury. This troth plight had never been cancelled, and the subsequent match was therefore irregular. Moreover it had been celebrated in an unconsecrated place, almost without witnesses, and the bride's mother, Jacquette of Bedford, had used sorcery to move the late king to the unblest union. As to the issue of the Duke of Clarence, their blood had been corrupted by their father's attainder. The protector therefore was the true male heir of the house of York, and the crown was his by right. The Londoners were aghast at this strange doctrine,

and when Gloucester himself, supported by his friend Buckingham, appeared to grace the termination of the harangue, they were received in dead silence, though they had vainly hoped to be greeted with acclamations of "God save King Richard".¹ But it was impossible to go back; two days later Buckingham summoned the mayor and corporation to the Guildhall, and made them a long and eloquent speech in which he rehearsed Dr. Shaw's arguments and many more. He painted the late king as a tyrant under whom no man was sure of his lands and no woman of her honour. He cited many instances of his cruelty, rapacity, and lust, and contrasted him to his disadvantage with that wise, staid, and religious prince the lord protector. Edward's children were undoubtedly bastards: Clarence's were debarred from succession; it only remained for them to petition Duke Richard to assert his rights and ascend the throne. The mayor and his fellows, so it is said, stood silent and confounded; but certain lewd fellows and retainers of the conspirators, who stood at the lower end of the hall, began to cry "Richard for king" and to throw up their caps. Thereupon Buckingham congratulated the corporation on their wise resolve, and went off to report their alleged consent to the protector.

Next day there was a great meeting of the estates held in St. Paul's; it was not a regular parliament, for the writs issued in the name of Edward V. had been countermanded, and many both of the peers and of the commons were not present. But, such as it was, the assembly received and gave its assent to a monstrous "consideration, election and petition," setting forth the right of Richard of Gloucester to the crown. It declared that the late king's "ungracious pretended marriage . . . made by sorcery and witchcraft . . . in a prophane place contrary to the law of God's Church," and despite a previous contract to Dame Eleanor, daughter of the Earl of Shrewsbury, had been invalid from the first; it was no more than "a sinful and damnable adultery". The children of the Duke of Clarence were disabled and debarred from all heritage; wherefore Richard of

¹ According to Sir Thomas More and Polydore Vergil, Shaw advanced another and more startling theory, namely, that there was a grave doubt as to the parentage of Edward IV. This was the "Blackburn" story which Clarence had been accused of putting about in 1478. See above, p. 462.

CHAP. Gloucester is "very inheritor of the crown and dignity royal by
XX. way of inheritance. All the estates have certain knowledge of his filiation."¹ His great wit, prudence, justice, and princely courage are known to all. Finally he is prayed that "according to this election of us, the three estates of the land, he will accept and take upon him the crown and royal dignity". Not a voice was raised against this strange petition. A deputation went to present the document to Gloucester at Baynard's Castle; after some modest show of reluctance he accepted it, and allowed himself to be saluted by Buckingham as King Richard III. The deputation then swore allegiance to him, and next day he went to Westminster, sat in the royal seat, and accepted the homage of the magnates, who were headed by the Dukes of Buckingham and Suffolk, and by Howard, who was created Duke of Norfolk on June 28.

The coronation was fixed for July 6. Before it took place news got abroad which gave evidence that the new reign was to be one of blood. On June 25, the day of the great assembly at St. Paul's, the prisoners who had been lying for the last month in Yorkshire, Rivers, Grey, Vaughan, and Hawte, had all been beheaded at Pontefract. They seem to have had some form of trial, with the Earl of Northumberland as chief judge, but Rivers was denied his undoubted right to be tried before his peers. Gloucester had the whole realm so completely under his control at this moment that these executions must be considered a piece of unnecessary cruelty, whose sole object was to terrify all possible adversaries. Whatever feeling may have been caused by the news was carefully suppressed, and the coronation ceremony was celebrated with great splendour—all the preparations which had been made for the anointing of Edward V. could be utilised for that of his successor. Archbishop Bouchier duly crowned Richard and his spouse Anne Neville, in the presence of almost the whole nobility of England; Buckingham officiated as chamberlain, Norfolk bore the cap of maintenance, the four swords were carried by the Earl of Northumberland, the Earl of Surrey (Norfolk's son), the Earl of Kent, and Lord Lovel. The magnates had committed themselves as accomplices, before or after the deed, to the act of usurpation. The nation accepted it with apparent apathy.

¹ This is a hint at the scandalous story about King Edward's illegitimacy.

After spending somewhat more than a fortnight in setting the machinery of the new government to work in London, Richard started for a long tour in the midlands, visiting Oxford, Gloucester, Worcester, Warwick, and other places, and holding high festival in each. It was apparently during his stay at Warwick, between July 7 and 15, that he took the step, as unwise as it was abominable, which was destined to prove his ruin. He sent one of his trusted retainers, Sir James Tyrrell, to London, with orders to make away with the two young princes, who had been kept in strict seclusion ever since the gates of the Tower had closed upon them. According to the accepted story, that given by Sir Thomas More, the constable of the Tower, Robert Brakenbury, had refused to take the hint given him that the further existence of the two lads was no longer necessary, and the king was obliged to send a less scrupulous or cautious emissary to execute his will. Tyrrell received charge of the keys of the fortress for one night, and during his brief tenure of authority caused the princes to be smothered by two ruffians, Dighton and Forrest, one of them his own groom, the other a warder. The bodies were buried under a side staircase of the White Tower, where they lay concealed till July 17, 1674, when their skeletons were discovered during some repairs, and were buried in Westminster Abbey by the orders of Charles II. For many years the exact manner of their end was unknown; the persons concerned in it kept strict silence, till in 1502 the survivors, Tyrrell and Dighton, were examined by order of Henry VII. and made depositions to the above purport. Richard himself never took the trouble to put abroad any official account of their deaths,¹ or even to acknow-

¹ There seems no reason to doubt More's version, though there are some small slips of detail in it. Tyrrell, when examined in 1502, was in trouble for another matter—connivance in the flight of the Duke of Suffolk, for which offence he was shortly afterwards beheaded. Dighton suffered no punishment in consequence of his confession. More speaks of their depositions as undoubtedly containing the truth of the matter. It is strange that Richard does not seem to have published any version of their deaths. The French chronicler Du Bellay, writing in the middle of the sixteenth century, says that the usurper gave out that the boys perished by falling from a bridge (*Mémoires*, liv., 1), but no English writer mentions this story. It was so generally known that they had been murdered, that the French chancellor alluded to the fact in his speech to the States General in the following January. For literature dealing with this subject see the Appendix on Authorities.

CHAP.
XX.

ledge that they had ceased to exist. It would have been wiser in the end to improvise some easy tale of a fever, a conflagration, or an accident, and to state formally that the male line of Edward IV. was extinct. For while the princes were believed by many persons to be still alive, and wild rumours circulated about their escape to the continent, the usurper's throne remained unsteady.

The murder of the princes was a blunder as well as a crime. The nation had acquiesced in the usurpation of King Richard; it had disapproved of the execution of Hastings and Rivers, yet had not been greatly shocked thereby. There were too many precedents for such violence between the death of the first Duke of Suffolk and that of George of Clarence. But this assassination of two harmless boys was by far the worst atrocity of the century. Even men of the easy morality of that age were horrified when the rumour got abroad. At first it was hardly believed, because of the incredible enormity of the act. But before long all those who cared to inquire into the matter could satisfy themselves that the princes were no longer in the Tower, and the few who were in the king's confidence knew for certain that they were dead. Even among those who had consented to act as the tools and accomplices of Richard's usurpation dismay and disgust prevailed. From that moment he could count on no supporters save men whom bribes could persuade to anything. His hard hand terrified the majority into submission, but they were only waiting for the first fair chance to shake off his yoke.

It seems probable that the knowledge that the princes had been murdered was the determining cause of the first and most surprising rebellion with which the king had to cope. Buckingham had acted as his unscrupulous lieutenant down to the moment of his coronation, and had accompanied him as far as Gloucester in his triumphal progress through the midlands. Yet two months later he was in arms to overthrow him. The Tudor chroniclers allege that the duke had been disappointed of some of the rewards that he had been promised, and in particular that he had been refused that half of the lands of the old earldom of Hereford which had passed to the crown—the other half he already owned, as representing the line of Thomas of Woodstock. Modern research does not bear out this state-

ment; Buckingham undoubtedly asked for the Bohun inheritance, but his request was granted; the king had given him possession of its profits and rents as from Easter, 1483, and also a charter whereby he pledged himself to procure an act of parliament which should put it permanently in the duke's hands.¹ No adequate explanation of Buckingham's conduct can be found save that, getting early knowledge of the death of the princes, he was disgusted to discover the full infamy of the situation into which his alliance with Richard had led him. It is to be noted that he put forward no claims of his own to the crown, though he represented the house of Thomas of Woodstock and descended through the Beauforts from John of Gaunt. Nor could he have hoped to secure under any other sovereign a higher position than he already enjoyed.

Be this as it may, Buckingham was in the autumn conspiring against King Richard. It is probable that he had been encouraged in his design by Bishop Morton of Ely, who had been committed to his custody after the scene in the Tower on June 13, and was residing with him in August and September in his castle of Brecon.² The scheme took it for granted that the sons of Edward IV. were already dead, for its object was to unite the claims of the houses of York and Lancaster by marrying the Lady Elizabeth, the eldest surviving daughter of the late king, to Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, the representative of the line of the Beauforts,³ and the heir of Henry VI., if only his ancestors had not been disabled from succession to the throne by the act of parliament of 1407, a point on which doubt was permissible. Richmond, it will be remembered, had fled out of the realm, in company with his uncle, Jasper Tudor, after Tewkesbury, and had been living ever since at the court of the Duke of Brittany. He was now a young man of twenty-seven: his character and capacity were unknown, and hitherto he had not been considered a serious factor in English politics. His mother, the Lady Margaret, through whom he derived his

¹ See Gairdner's *Richard III.*, pp. 105-6.

² So Morton told Sir Thomas More, with many details of their conversation, and so More has written it down in his history.

³ See the Genealogical Table in Appendix II. Henry's mother was the only child of the first Duke of Somerset: for her claim see p. 355. When the last of her cousins fell at Tewkesbury in 1471 no male Beaufort heir survived. Henry was her only child by Edmund of Richmond, half-brother of King Henry VI.

CHAP.
XX.

dynastic claim, such as it was, had not gone into exile; she had wedded as her second husband a staunch Yorkist, that Lord Stanley whom King Richard had imprisoned on June 13 Stanley was now at large again; he had made his peace with the new king, though he was grievously mistrusted.

It would seem that Buckingham found a plot already on foot, in which the survivors of the Woodville faction, and other Yorkists who were true to the memory of Edward IV., had enlisted, before they were aware of his discontent with the existing *régime*. The leaders were Dorset, his brother Lionel Woodville, Bishop of Salisbury; Sir Thomas St. Leger, who had married Anne Plantagenet, the eldest daughter of Richard Duke of York; Peter Courtenay, Bishop of Exeter, and Sir John Fogge, late treasurer of the royal household. Their strength was not great; only in the south and west could they count on any supporters, but the accession of Buckingham made them hopeful. They had originally intended to rise in the name of Edward V., and had been much disconcerted when his death was reported. Now all fell in with the plan for wedding the Lady Elizabeth to Richmond, as the device which would enlist the greatest possible number of supporters.

The insurrection was timed to break out on October 18; an earlier date might have been fixed, but it was necessary to communicate with Richmond in Brittany, and to allow him time to collect ships and mercenary bands for a landing on the south coast. In all probability it was this delay which ruined the conspirators: on October 11 the king was warned of the plot, and issued orders for the raising of an army. It is said that some premature riots in Kent had roused his suspicions: be this as it may, he was already at the head of a considerable force when the plotters raised their banners on the appointed day. There were gatherings at Guildford, Salisbury, Maidstone, Newbury, and Exeter; but all were dispersed with ease, for no aid came from Buckingham. The duke had taken arms at Brecon, and had collected some thousands of Welsh and Marchmen, but as he moved towards the Severn to join his friends, he was foiled by ten days of continuous rain, which brought down such floods that bridges were swept away and fords made useless. Buckingham advanced as far as the Forest of Dean, but could get no further. Royalist levies

gathered behind the Severn in force, and some Welsh chiefs captured Brecon in his rear. The duke's host began to fall away from him, and in despair he disguised himself and took to flight. A few days later he was betrayed by a retainer in whose house he had taken refuge. The sheriff of Shropshire forwarded him to the king at Salisbury, and Richard beheaded him without a moment's delay on November 1. He then moved to Exeter, where he captured and executed his own brother-in-law, St. Leger, and two other conspirators. Most of the leading rebels fled over-sea or took sanctuary, but some six or eight more were captured at various places and suffered the punishment of traitors in London. Richmond, whose voyage had been delayed by the same tempest that ruined Buckingham, reached Plymouth only to find that his adherents were crushed, and sailed back to Brittany.

The suppression of this rebellion was Richard's first and only success during his short reign. It is probable that even this feeble rising might have ruined him, if the insurgents had not been disconcerted by the foul weather; if they had been granted time to unite, and had kept the field for a few days, half the realm would have gone over to them. But mere chance combined with the king's activity to ruin them. Richard still felt his throne insecure; he knew that every man's hand was against him, and it is probable that Sir Thomas More gives a true picture of his restless and suspicious bearing, when he describes how "he was never quiet in his mind, never thought himself secure. When he went abroad his eyes whirled about, his body was privily fenced, his hand ever on his dagger, his countenance and manner like one always ready to strike again. He took ill rest at nights, lay long waking and musing; sore wearied with care and watch, he rather slumbered than slept. So was his restless heart continually tossed and tumbled with the tedious impression and stormy remembrance of his most abominable deeds."¹

Richard faced his first and only parliament on January 23, 1484, and endeavoured to make as favourable an impression as possible on the estates. A great bill of attainder, comprising the names of all who had been concerned in the late rebellion, was

¹ More says that he had the details "from such as were secret with his chamberers".

CHAP.
XX.

inevitable; such documents always followed a party triumph since 1459. But an attempt to show comparative mercy in the distribution of punishments was made, and many of the attainted persons, even including Bishop Morton and Sir Richard Woodville, were afterwards offered pardons. Among the provisions made was one to the effect that Richmond's mother, the Lady Margaret, having been detected in correspondence with her son, should forfeit her estates, but that they should be granted for life to her husband, Stanley, with remainder to the crown. The confiscated lands of the other persons attainted were lavished upon Richard's supporters, whereby, as More sagely remarks, he bought but unsteadfast friendship with his great gifts. The most important act of the parliament was the passing of a bill which confirmed the succession, as settled at the meeting in St. Paul's in the preceding June. The right line of descent was declared to lie with Richard and "the heirs of his body begotten"; his only son Edward had in the preceding August been created Prince of Wales. The magnates, in a non-parliamentary meeting, swore personal allegiance to the young heir "in a new form of oath previously unknown". The king asked for no subsidies, but was granted tannage and poundage for life—as his brother, Edward IV., had been. The clergy, sitting separately in convocation, voted a tenth. Many bills of the usual sort, dealing with trade and manufactures, were passed, as also an act against "secret enfeoffments"—a favourite device of those who wished to save their lands from confiscation in those troublous times. More notable, and wholly praiseworthy, if only it had been observed, was an act declaring benevolences, the favourite device of the late king, illegal. Another excellent measure was directed against corrupt juries and the practice of intimidation by men of local influence. If we had no means of judging Richard's rule save the official records of his parliament, we should be forced to regard him as a benevolent, economical, and well-intentioned sovereign.

Soon after parliament had risen on February 20, the king induced his brother's widow and her daughters to come out of sanctuary, by promising her the modest pension of 700 marks a year, and undertaking to provide dowers for all her children and to marry them to gentlemen of good estate. If Richard had used his opportunity, he might have checkmated all the

plots of Richmond by wedding the Lady Elizabeth to some person of approved incapacity and insignificance. He refrained from doing so, and the conspiracy went on. The conduct of the queen-dowager, "Elizabeth Grey" as Richard called her, is hard to explain; whether she feared to be taken from sanctuary by force, or whether she was merely tired of her forlorn existence at Westminster, and had resolved to be reconciled to the murderer of her sons out of mere callous apathy, seems uncertain.

CHAP.
XX.

A few weeks later King Richard's misfortunes began; he received the news that his only son Edward Prince of Wales had died at Middleham on April 9. Queen Anne, though still a young woman, was already a confirmed invalid, and unlikely to bear any more children. Thus the succession question was reopened. The king is said to have shown signs of desperate grief; he was not such an unnatural monster as to be destitute of the feelings of a father. After some hesitation he proclaimed as his heir John de la Pole, the son of his eldest surviving sister Elizabeth and of the Duke of Suffolk. He had first designated Clarence's son, Edward Earl of Warwick; but to undo the consequences of his brother's attainder would have been to give Warwick a right to the throne far better than his own. So Warwick was disavowed, and the young De la Pole was made lord-lieutenant of Ireland and president of the council of the north, to mark his promotion to the position of heir-presumptive.

Throughout the summer of 1484 Richard remained in the north, whither he had been drawn by complications on the side of Scotland. It will be remembered that Edward IV., shortly before his death, had resumed his intrigues with Albany. That unstable prince had once more fled to England, and had obtained from the new king a promise that he would continue his brother's policy. In February war broke out, but no military incidents of importance followed. Richard had hoped that Albany would be able to raise a strong party in Scotland; but when he and his friend the Earl of Douglas crossed the border with their own retainers and a body of Cumbrian horse, the whole countryside turned out against them. At the combat of Lochmaben, on July 22, the invaders were routed; Douglas was taken prisoner and sent to end his days in a monastery;

CHAP. Albany escaped to Carlisle with the remnant of his force.
XX. Disappointed at the result of this raid, and convinced that it was unwise to embark in a Scottish war while his throne was still unsteady, Richard made peace with James III. on September 20, and sent away Albany to France, where he was killed at a tournament not many months after.

While the king was detained in the north, his ambassadors were busy on the continent. They secured his recognition by the pope, by the Archduke Maximilian in Flanders, and by Ferdinand and Isabella in Spain. France, however, showed a hostile spirit; King Louis XI. had died on August 30, 1483, and his daughter Anne, regent for her young brother, Charles VIII., harboured all English malcontents and refused to open friendly relations with Richard. For a moment in the summer of 1484 the king imagined that he might crush his chief adversary Richmond, for he had bribed Pierre Landois, the corrupt minister of the Duke of Brittany,¹ to seize and surrender the earl, who still made his headquarters at Vannes. But the exile was warned in time of the proposed treason, and fled to the French court, where the regent received him, gave him presents of money, and permitted him to gather together the adherents who came to seek him. The most important of them were his uncle, Jasper Tudor; Morton, Bishop of Ely; the Marquis of Dorset, and the Earl of Oxford, the last of the great Lancastrian leaders. Oxford had been imprisoned by Edward IV. after his wild adventure at St. Michael's Mount, and had only just escaped after ten years in a dungeon, yet was eager to recommence the fray.

The presence of Richmond at the French court was the most threatening symptom of the time from Richard's point of view; for the earl had now a protector who both could and would give him effective aid when the opportunity arrived. A French invasion followed by a general rising of malcontents might occur at any moment. The very fact that the blow was long delayed seems to have shaken Richard's nerve and to have kept him in an agony of suspense. False rumours that the pretender was at sea on a French squadron were current all through the winter

¹ The Duke Francis was a consistent supporter of Richmond, but at this moment he was sick, and his minister proposed to sell the exile without his knowledge. The Breton nobles hanged Landois not long after.

of 1484-85 and the ensuing spring. Fleets and great levies by land were repeatedly ordered and countermanded, and much money was spent. At last the exchequer was empty, and the king, fearing to call another parliament, had recourse to the same unconstitutional devices for collecting money which he had denounced only a year before. Between February and April, 1485, he raised some £20,000 by forced loans, which only differed from the benevolences of Edward IV. in that Richard professed his intention of repaying them as soon as his necessities should permit. But it was a fatal mistake to fall back upon arbitrary taxation: nothing could have contributed more surely to sap the small remains of his popularity.

That the king's suspicions as to the loyalty of his subjects were well founded was shown by the flight of many notable persons to France. Richmond's emissaries were going up and down the land, and they were seldom betrayed or detected. A few executions took place, of which the best remembered is that of one William Collingbourne, late sheriff of Wiltshire. It was he who hung on the door of St. Paul's the famous couplet:—

The Catte, the Ratte, and Lovell our dogge
Rulyth all Englande under a Hogge.

The allusion was to Richard's badge of the white boar, and to the names of his three confidants, Francis, Lord Lovel, his chamberlain, Sir William Catesby, speaker of the parliament of 1484, and Sir Richard Ratcliffe. Collingbourne was condemned for making arrangements for the landing of Richmond in Dorsetshire, and executed in December, 1484.¹

The main topic which seems to have occupied men's minds in the early spring of 1485 was an astounding rumour that the king was designing to divorce his invalid queen, and to marry in her stead his niece the Lady Elizabeth. His dealings with her had already provoked comment. She was kept at court and treated with high respect, in no wise as if she were illegitimate, but like a royal princess. It is said that Richard made repeated complaints to Archbishop Rotherham and others of his wife's persistent ill-health, lamented his want of heirs, and hinted at the

¹ There is some dispute as to the exact date of Collingbourne's treasonable correspondence, see Gairdner's *Richard III.*, pp. 186-91, and Sir James Ramsay's *Lancaster and York*, ii., 528. Probably the *second* year (Oct., 1484) is the correct date of his plot, not the *first*.

CHAP. necessity of obtaining them by a divorce and a second marriage.
 XX. No match presented such political advantages as one with his niece, if only public opinion would endure the monstrous and repulsive idea. There is some evidence that the queen-dowager, the most callous and apathetic of women, took the proposal into serious consideration; it has even been supposed, but with no convincing proof, that the princess herself was not unwilling to share her uncle's bloodstained throne.¹ Queen Anne died after a long illness on March 16; it is probable that knowledge of her husband's designs embittered her last days and shortened her life, though the Tudor historians who insinuate that he deliberately worried her to death, or even poisoned her, are no doubt in error. After her decease the rumour that Richard was about to obtain a papal dispensation to marry his niece became so widespread, and provoked such indignation, that his councillors Catesby and Ratcliffe warned him that the scheme must be disavowed. The king yielded to their suasion, called together the mayor and aldermen of London, and publicly repudiated the intentions attributed to him, complaining that he was slandered without reason. The Princess Elizabeth was sent away to Sheriff-Hutton Castle, but Richard still refrained from finding her a husband—the one way in which he could have caused malevolent rumours to cease, and at the same time have defeated Richmond's schemes.

In May the king left London and began to patrol the midlands, where, apparently, he suspected danger. All through the early summer he was moving about in the direction of Kenilworth, Coventry, Leicester, and Nottingham. Commissioners of array had been sent round the whole realm, with orders that the shire levies should be ready to move at one day's notice. A fleet under Lovel was collected at Southampton to watch the Channel, while a smaller squadron was kept in the North Sea. Sir James Tyrrell, the man who is commonly supposed to have murdered the princes in the Tower, was placed in charge of the marches of Calais, for it was possible that Richmond's

¹ Polydore Vergil, in the next generation, gives elaborate details as to the queen-dowager's unnatural behaviour. See also the Croyland Continuator, p. 572. That the consent of the Princess Elizabeth was obtained is only supported by a letter quoted (*temp.* James I.) by the antiquary Sir George Buck, who says that he found it among the papers of the Duke of Norfolk, to whom it was addressed. The document is not now forthcoming.

attack might begin in that quarter. Money was spent lavishly in preparations, all the forced loans, together with the tenth obtained from the convocation of Canterbury, being devoted to military and naval expenses. The long delay in the coming of the invader made the king more and more nervous, for he supposed that his rival was perfecting his arrangements for a general insurrection. This was indeed the case; Richmond was now in close relations with all the malcontents; the Yorkists who loved the memory of Edward IV. were in correspondence with him, no less than the wrecks of the Lancastrian party. His main hope was in his step-father Stanley, who since he had been acquitted of complicity in Buckingham's rebellion had maintained a cautious attitude, yet was ready to move when he thought that treason would be safe. The Stanley interest was now predominant all over Lancashire and Cheshire, where no other great baronial house survived. It extended into the Welsh lands; Stanley's son had married the heiress of the Stranges, and possessed the marcher-barony of Knockyn, while his brother Sir William was at this moment justiciar of North Wales. The freedom of action of the head of the family was hampered, however, by the fact that Richard was holding his heir as a hostage, and had let it be known that any open act of disloyalty would be visited on the young man's head.

CHAP.
XX.

At last on August 1 Henry of Richmond set sail from Harfleur; the Regent Anne of France had lent him 60,000 francs, and collected for him 1,800 mercenaries and a small fleet. The adventurer was accompanied by his uncle, Jasper Tudor, the Earl of Oxford, Sir Edward Woodville, Sir John Welles, heir of the attainted barony of Welles, Sir Edward Courtenay, who claimed the earldom of Devon, his kinsman the Bishop of Exeter, Morton, Bishop of Ely, and some scores of exiled knights and squires, among whom Yorkists were almost as numerous as Lancastrians. The French auxiliaries were under a Savoyard captain named Philibert de Chaundé. The Marquis of Dorset and Sir John Bouchier had been left at Paris in pledge for the loan made by the French government. Richmond did not desire to have the marquis with him, for he had been detected in correspondence with his mother the queen-dowager, who urged him to abandon conspiracy and submit to King Richard. Stealing down the Breton coast, so as to avoid

CHAP.
XX.

the English fleet, Richmond turned northward when he had passed the longitude of Lands End, and came ashore in Milford Haven on August 7. He had selected this remote region as his landing point both because he knew that he was expected to strike at the English south coast, and because he had assurance of help from many old retainers of his uncle the Earl of Pembroke. He was himself a Welshman and could make a good appeal to the local patriotism of his countrymen. On landing he raised not only the royal banner of England but the ancient standard of Cadwallader, a red dragon upon a field of white and green, the beast which was afterwards used as the device of the house of Tudor. and the sinister supporter of their coat-of-arms.

For a few days Henry received but trifling reinforcements, but he struck into the Cardiganshire mountains, a district where, if his adherents were slow to join him, he might hope to maintain an irregular warfare in the style of Owen Glendower. After a short delay the Welsh gentry began to come in to his aid; the wealthiest and most warlike chief Rhys ap Thomas consented to put himself at their head, after he had been promised the justiciarship of South Wales. Sir Walter Herbert had charge of the district in King Richard's name, but the levies that he called out melted away to the invader's camp, and he himself was suspected of half-heartedness. Richmond met no resistance as he conducted his ever-growing host across Cardiganshire toward the upper Severn. By way of Newtown and Welshpool he came down on Shrewsbury, which opened its gates on August 15 after one day's parleying; this was a good omen, for hitherto the earl had received no help save from the Welsh. On the next day but one Sir Gilbert Talbot, uncle and guardian of the young Earl of Shrewsbury, joined him with 500 of the retainers of his old Lancastrian house. From this moment onward English malcontents with small bodies of recruits kept pouring into Richmond's camp, but though he advanced boldly into the midlands, making directly towards Richard's post at Nottingham, his whole force was still small; he had not more than 5,000 men at the decisive battle that gave him the crown. His confidence was due to the fact that he had secret promises of aid from all sides; the Stanleys had let him pass Shrewsbury unmolested, and had sent him

word that they would place the forces of Cheshire and Lancashire at his disposition when they had got Lord Strange out of the king's hands. Many other magnates had already given similar assurances. CHAP.
XX.

Meanwhile Richard had received the news of the invader's landing somewhat later than he had expected, owing to the remoteness of Milford Haven. When he learnt that Richmond was marching straight towards him, he ordered out all the shire levies which had been so long ready, and summoned in his most trustworthy adherents in the baronage. Norfolk, Northumberland, and some twenty more of the peers rallied to his standard at Leicester within a few days,¹ but the lords of the extreme south and west were still absent when the crisis came. Lord Stanley, who had been summoned with the rest, sent a futile excuse, yet raised all Cheshire and Lancashire under his own banner and advanced as far as Lichfield. His son Strange made an attempt to escape from custody and join him, whereupon Richard put him in irons, and sent word to his father that if he turned traitor his son should be beheaded without a moment's delay. This did not prevent Sir William Stanley, who commanded a part of the Cheshire levies, from visiting Richmond's camp at Stafford, and pledging himself to join him on the battlefield; but the head of the house hung back as long as possible, to save the life of his heir.

On August 20 the earl's army advanced from Tamworth to Atherstone, while the king had gathered his forces at Leicester. On the 21st the one moved forward from Atherstone to the White Moor, a few miles south-west from Bosworth, while the other marched out from Leicester to Sutton Cheney; only two miles divided their camps, and it was obvious that a decisive engagement must take place next day. The host of the Stanleys, with Sir William leading its vaward, and Lord Stanley keeping discreetly to the rear, was near Bosworth that same evening, equidistant from the two hostile armies. Both the king and Richmond were aware of its approach, and neither was pleased, for

¹ If the *Ballad of Bosworth Feilde* can be trusted, there were with the king the following peers: Norfolk, Kent, Surrey, Lincoln, Northumberland, Westmorland, Zouch, Maltravers, Arundel, Grey of Codnor, Audley, Berkeley, Ferrers of Chartley and Ferrers of Groby, Fitzhugh, Dacre, Scrope of Bolton, Scrope of Upsal, Lumley, and Greystock. Lovel seems to have been still with the fleet in the Channel. The list cannot be trusted for all the names.

CHAP.
XX.

Richard apprehended treason, and his rival had hoped to be openly joined by these cautious allies before the battle began. The king was well aware that the spirit of his troops was unsatisfactory; his confidential advisers had warned him that treachery was on foot; and unless he could bear down the enemy by his first onset, his superior numbers—he had two men to Richmond's one—were not likely to avail him much. But he trusted to his own energy and military skill, and hoped to conquer despite the lukewarmness of the majority of his followers. Nevertheless he had dismal forebodings; his rest was broken by horrible dreams, and he showed next morning a face not only haggard, but disfigured with a death-like pallor.¹ But his courage was unbroken, and he promised victory to his doubting captains in words of haughty confidence. His position was excellent; the army was drawn out in the usual three divisions on the slopes of Ambion Hill, a well-marked rising ground two miles south of Bosworth. It was partly divided from the enemy by marshy fields formed by the little river Sence. The king led the main battle, the Duke of Norfolk the vaward or right wing, the Earl of Northumberland the rear.

His adversaries, on the other side of the marsh, had formed their smaller host in two divisions only; the Earl of Oxford led the vaward, while the main battle was under Richmond's own command. Contrary to what might have been expected, they took the offensive, reckoning, no doubt, on treachery in the king's ranks. They moved off eastward, Oxford's corps leading, till they had circumvented the marshy ground, and faced the royalists with the sun at their backs and the wind also behind them—advantages of no mean importance in the archery-fight which always opened an English engagement. When they had cleared the boggy tract, and began to advance up the slopes of Ambion Hill, with their western flank still covered by the impassable marsh, the king first opened upon them with his artillery, and then charged down upon them. Norfolk's corps came into collision with that of Oxford, while Richard attacked the earl's main body. Northumberland, on the other wing of the royal host, deliberately held back and would not get into action. Before ordering the line to advance, the king

¹ Croyland Continuator, p. 374.

had sent orders to Lord Stanley to draw in to his banner, and when he made no movement issued a command for the instant execution of his son Strange. But those charged with the matter wisely deferred obedience till the battle should be over, and the young man escaped with his life.

When the two armies came into close contact it was at once evident that many of the king's men were not inclined to fight. They hung back, kept up a feeble archery fire from a distance, and refused to close. Oxford, who had halted to receive the attack, bade his banner go forward again, and began to mount the slopes. On this more serious fighting began, for Norfolk with his son Surrey, and some others of the king's adherents, tried to do their duty, and fell hotly upon the earl's front. At the same moment Richard himself, having marked the position of Richmond in the hostile line, charged at the head of his bodyguard, broke into the Lancastrian main body and seemed for a moment likely to prevail. He slew with his own hand, as it is said, Sir William Brandon, Richmond's standard-bearer, and encountered the earl hand to hand for a short space. But by this moment the battle was lost, for Sir William Stanley, who had been drawing nearer ever since the fighting began, now fell upon Richard's host in flank and rear. With a cry of treason the royalist main body broke up and fled. The Stanleys took up the pursuit, which passed away to the east with no great slaughter, for the pursuers understood that the vanquished had no heart in the struggle and had deliberately given them the victory.

King Richard, however, refused to fly, though faithful friends brought him his horse, and bade him escape while they held back the enemy for a moment. The usurper replied that at least he would die King of England, and plunged back into the fight. A moment later, shouting "Treason! treason!" as he laid about him with his battle-axe, he was ringed round by many foes and hewn down; his helmet was battered through and his brains beaten out. It was the end of a brave man, and his courage touched the heart even of those who remembered his crimes. The finest stanzas written in fifteenth century England were given to his memory by an admiring enemy, a retainer of the Stanleys, who wrote the *Ballad of Lady Bessie*:—

CHAP. Then a knight to King Richard gan say—good Sir William Harrington—
 XX. He saith “all wee are like this day to the death soone to be done;
 There may no man their strokes abide, the Stanleys’ dints they be so stronge,
 Yee may come back at another tide, methinks yee tarry here too longe,
 Your horsse at your hand is ready, another day you may worshipp win
 And come to raigne with royaltie, and weare your crown and be our king”.
 “Nay, give me my battle-axe in my hand, sett the crowne of England on my
 head so high,
 For by Him that made both sea and land, King of England this day I will dye.
 One foot I will never flee whilst the breath is my brest within.”
 As he said so did it be—if hee lost his life he died a king.¹

The battered crown which had fallen from Richard’s helmet was found in a hawthorn bush, where it had probably been hidden by a plunderer, and set on the head of Richmond by Lord Stanley, while all the victorious army hailed the earl by his new title of Henry VII.

Along with the king there fell his chief supporter, John Duke of Norfolk; the Lord Ferrers of Chartley, Sir Richard Ratcliffe, his well-known councillor, Sir Robert Brakenbury, lieutenant of the Tower of London, Sir Robert Percy, controller of the royal household, Sir William Conyers, and about 1,000 others, as was reported, probably with some exaggeration, for the battle had not been hot nor the pursuit merciless. The victors lost not above 100 men, of whom the only personage of note was the standard-bearer Sir William Brandon. The Earl of Surrey was taken prisoner, grievously wounded, and lodged in prison. Catesby was captured in the flight, and executed along with two yeomen of the king’s chamber—a father and son named Breacher. These were the only lives taken in cold blood by Henry of Richmond. The corpse of Richard was stripped and carried to Leicester across the back of a horse in unseemly fashion, with head and arms hanging down. It was exposed to the public view for two days, and then decently buried in the church of the Greyfriars. His monument was destroyed and his bones scattered at the dissolution of the monasteries.

¹ I have corrected some obvious verbal errors in *Lady Bessie* mainly from the parallel passage—nearly the same in wording—in *Bosworth Feilde*. See *Percy Folio MS.*, iii., 257 and 362.

APPENDIX I.

ON AUTHORITIES.

OF this period alone of English medieval history can it be said that the original authorities grow worse and scantier as the years pass by. Not only do the chronicles gradually sink from history into meagre annals, and finally dry up altogether as the Yorkist dynasty nears its end, but the official documents are far less accessible to the student than in the times of the earlier Plantagenets. This is due to the fact that the *Record Office Publications* do not touch the fifteenth century save in one or two sections. Till the stores of the Record Office have been calendared, the historian may pursue his own special lines of interest by working at the unprinted originals, but cannot hope to grapple with the whole mass of unsorted material. APP. I.

Chronicles.—The most notable of the original authorities for the reign of Richard II. is the group of chronicles connected with the name of THOMAS WALSHINGHAM. This writer, the last of the great medieval chroniclers, was in charge of the scriptorium at St. Albans, till, in 1394, he was made prior of Wymondham; but he resigned the priory and returned to the mother-house some six years after, there to remain till his death, *circa* 1422. As he had begun writing by about 1380, his literary life was a long one, and this accounts for the bulk and the oft-revised and rewritten character of his work. There are ascribed to him (1) a chronicle named by its editor, Sir E. Maunde Thompson, *Chronicon Angliae* (Rolls Series, 1874) extending from 1328 to 1388; the earlier years are a compilation, but the part 1377-88 is original and very valuable. The author is a furious enemy of John of Gaunt, whom he hates both for his unconstitutional practices and for the support that he gave to Wycliffe. The narrative is full of useful information as to Wat Tyler's rebellion and the Lollards. (2) A history of England from 1272 to 1392, of which the early part is a compilation, but the later section, 1377-92, while adhering on the whole to the wording of the *Chronicon Angliae*, has some additions and a good many alterations, all in the direction of toning down the

APP 1. violence of the language used against John of Gaunt in the earlier work. It was apparently rewritten either after the reconciliation of Richard II. and his uncle in 1390, or else after the accession of the house of Lancaster to the throne. (3) We have finally the *Historia Anglicana*, beginning in 1272, and extending down to 1422 (Rolls Series, 1863). This is based upon No. (2), but has some omissions and a few additions in the parts where they coincide, as well as a certain change in diction inclining to "fine writing". Some modern students have believed that the *Historia Anglicana* was not Walsingham's own work, but that another monk of St. Albans had edited and rewritten his chronicle, continuing it down to 1422. Such was the view of Riley, who edited the *Historia* for the Rolls Series, and is apparently that of Sir E. Maunde Thompson. Dr. James Gairdner in his *Early English Chronicles* (1879) controverts this theory, and his vindication of the authorship of the *Historia* seems now to be generally accepted. In addition to his thrice-rewritten English history, Walsingham published under Henry V. his *Ypodigma Neustriae*, of which further notice is given below (p. 501). The fact that he could write this book in 1419, seems to show that he may well have carried down the *Historia* in 1422.

As a corrective to Walsingham's anti-Lancastrian prejudices, we have the *Continuator of Knighton*, an anonymous author who wrote annals of the years 1377-95 at Leicester. He was an admirer and probably a dependant of John of Gaunt, all of whose actions, save his support of Wycliffe, are duly praised. He gives many details about the Lollards and their early doings in and around Leicester, and some useful information about Wat Tyler's rebellion. Another continuator is JOHN MALVERNE, who carried on Higden's *Polychronicon* from 1352 to 1394; but he cannot be compared for interest or useful information to Knighton's successor. His work is contained in Higden, ix. (Rolls Series, 1886). Yet another work of a similar sort is that of the continuator of the *Eulogium Historiarum* (Rolls Series, 1863), who brought the chronicle of Thomas of Malmesbury down from 1366 to 1413. His notices of parliamentary matters are not without value. Here also must be mentioned the anonymous "Monk of Evesham," who wrote a *Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi II.*, extending down to 1402. He follows Walsingham from 1377 to 1390, but then commences a narrative of his own, written in a tone very hostile to the king. The only edition is Hearne's (printed at Oxford, 1729). Equally hostile in tone are the valuable *Annales Ricardi II. et Henrici IV.* (Rolls Series, 1866).

For the French wars and the diplomatic history of Richard II.

the English chronicles can be supplemented from the *Chronique d'un religieux de St. Denis*, 1380-1422, whose author visited England at least once on diplomatic work, and still more from FROISSART, who is invaluable for continental affairs, and can occasionally be utilised even for domestic events. His spirited narrative of the revolt of 1381 contains some incidents which can be verified by comparison with English annals. Far more valuable for this great convulsion is another work in French, the so-called *Anonimal Chronicle of St. Mary's, York*, a short narrative of the rebellion evidently written by an eye-witness, and containing a large number of facts and details not elsewhere to be found. It survives only in a transcript made by Stow's friend Francis Thynne, in 1592, and printed by Mr. G. M. Trevelyan in the *English Historical Review* for 1898. The French is vile, and has been made still harder to read by Thynne's errors of copying. A translation of it may be found in C. OMAN'S *Great Revolt of 1381* (Oxford, 1906). For the end of the reign of Richard II. we have three works written by foreigners all of some importance. The first is JEAN CRÉTON'S metrical *Histoire du Roy d'Angleterre Richard II., traictant particulièrement la rebellion de ses sujets* (ed. Buchon, *Collection des Chroniques Françaises*, xxiv., Paris, 1826). Créton was present with Richard, whom he much admired, on his expedition to Ireland in 1399, and is a first-rate witness for the year of his fall. He also went to Scotland a few years later on a secret mission from the French court, to see whether the *soi-disant* Richard sheltered by the Duke of Albany was an impostor or no. The other two works are perhaps founded on Créton in part. They are the *Chronique de la traison et mort de Richard II.* (English Historical Society, 1846), and JEAN LE BEAU'S *Chronique de Richard II.* (ed. Buchon, *Collection des Chroniques Françaises*, xxv., supplement ii., Paris, 1826). They possess so much similarity that some have supposed that the latter is no more than a redaction or abridgment of the former. Both contain useful information, and are anti-Lancastrian in sentiment.

When we enter the Lancastrian period, we find no single good chronicle covering any great section of the epoch. Indeed the only works which deal with the whole of it are two very thin productions generally known as the "*Chronicle*, ed. Giles," and the "*Chronicle*, ed. Davies," and cited under those titles in this work. The first is entitled in full, *Chronicon Angliae temporibus Ricardi II., Henrici IV., Henrici V. et Henrici VI.*, edited by J. A. Giles in 1848. The part dealing with Richard II. has been copied wholesale from the "*Monk of Evesham*," while the reign of Henry V. has been taken

APP. I. entirely from Elmham's *Vita et Gesta*, but the sections on Henry IV. and VI. are original, and not without their use. "*Chron.*, ed. Davies," or *An English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II. and Henry IV., V. and VI.*, was edited for the Camden Society by the Rev. J. S. Davies in 1856. Its early parts are a compilation of no value, written on the end of the *Chronicle of the Brute*; ¹ but for the reign of Henry VI., where the author is writing as a contemporary and a furious Yorkist, it has often to be employed.

These two chronicles, covering all the Lancastrian period, are meagre, and supply less detail than the authors next to be mentioned, who deal only with smaller sections of the century. There is a fair amount of miscellaneous information of the minor sort for the reigns of Henry IV. and Henry V. to be obtained from ADAM OF USK, a Welsh priest and a dependant of the Mortimers. He was a strange, flighty being, who, after serving Henry IV. for some time, was outlawed for assault and robbery, fled abroad, and came back to follow the fortunes of Owen Glendower for a short time. He returned to his allegiance, was pardoned, and died about 1422. He is valuable for all Welsh and marchland details, *e.g.*, the movements of Richard II. and Henry IV. in 1399, and the campaigns of Glendower, and also has very full details of the deposition of Richard. The early years of his work are almost valueless, but from 1397 to 1422 he is full of interest, and gives much that is not to be found in any other chronicle. The edition by Sir E. Maunde Thompson published in 1904 supersedes the earlier incomplete text of 1876. THOMAS OF OTTERBOURNE'S chronicle is short and jejune. It extends from "Brute the Trojan" to the siege of Rouen by Henry V. and the assassination of John the Fearless. For the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., and Henry V. it has considerable value in matters of small detail, as Otterbourne, working quite independent of other writers, jotted down many facts not to be found elsewhere. But he has little or no power either of generalisation or of accurate observation. The only printed text is that issued by Hearne in 1727. On a level with Otterbourne from the intellectual point of view is JOHN CAPGRAVE, an Austin friar of Lynn, who wrote in English a chronicle from the Creation to 1417, and a *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*. Both are edited (very badly) in the Rolls Series (1858). The author is given to sycophantic eulogies of the Lancastrian dynasty. The "Illustrious Henries" include not only contemporary worthies of that name, but the Emperors Henry I. to VII., the three early English kings, Henry I. to III., and Henry

¹ For which see Appendix on Authorities in Mr. Tout's volume of this history.

Despenser, Bishop of Norwich, the queller of the revolt of 1381 in APP. I East Anglia.

For Henry V. we have, beside the chronicles which continue on to his time from an earlier generation, like Walsingham, Usk, and Otterbourne, a versified *Liber Metricus de Henrico Quinto* (Rolls Series, 1858), and a prose *Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti*, by THOMAS ELMHAM, a monk of St. Austin's, Canterbury. The former, like most poetical history, possesses little worth; the latter seems to owe most of its value to excerpts from the anonymous *Gesta Henrici Quinti Angliae Regis*, a most important narrative by a chaplain of Henry V. covering the first four years of that sovereign. The writer witnessed the siege of Harfleur and the battle of Agincourt, was a good observer and possessed an interesting style. Another valuable source for Henry's French invasions is WALSINGHAM'S *Ypodigma Neustriae* (Rolls Series, 1876), which, though cumbered by much early Norman history written at second hand, becomes valuable for contemporary events; unfortunately it stops short in 1419. The siege of Rouen was described by John Page, a contemporary, in English verse, but with little accuracy of detail (Camden Society, 1876). GEORGE CHASTELLAIN'S *Chronique de Normandie* (1414-22), printed along with the Chaplain's Narrative in the edition by B. Williams (English Historical Society, 1846), completes the reign, but is written long after, and full of errors. Other invaluable sources for Henry's doings in France are the chronicles of JOUVENEL DES URSINS (1380-1422), entitled *Histoire de Charles VI.*, and MONSTRELET'S *Chronique* (1400-44), both often edited.

It is curious to note how many of the chronicles break off at, or shortly before, the death of Henry V. When Usk, Otterbourne, Walsingham, Capgrave, and Elmham cease, there is no successor to take on the task of recording English history. The early years of the reign of Henry VI., or at anyrate their domestic incidents, are less known to us than any other twenty years since the Conquest. JOHN OF AMUNDESHAM, who has left short notes on the period 1422-40, is unfortunately only a historian of St. Albans Abbey, who mentions events of public interest by chance, because they touch his local theme. WILLIAM OF WORCESTER (or Bottoner), edited by J. Stevenson in his *Wars of the English in France* (Rolls Series, 1864), covers the period, but only in the most meagre fashion, as he does not begin to dilate on affairs till his own day is reached, and his *oruit* was 1445-69 rather than 1422-45. He was a dependant of the celebrated Sir John Fastolf, and a strong partisan of the house of York. JOHN HARDYNG is a strictly contemporary writer. He was

APP. I. present at Agincourt, and died at a great old age, somewhere about 1465; but his chronicle of the Lancastrian kings in English verse is meagre and dull. Our confidence in him is not increased by the fact that he was a professional forger. He was employed by the government, under Henry VI., to make out a statement for the English suzerainty over the crown of Scotland, and strengthened his case by inventing and inserting many false documents. He wrote his chronicle at the end of his life, and is both inaccurate and untrustworthy. JOHN BLACKMAN'S laudatory *Life of Henry VI.* is useful for the king's character, but not for his policy or acts (ed. Hearne, Oxford, 1732).

So far as England can be said to have any contemporary historians at all between the death of Henry V. and the outbreak of the Wars of the Roses, we must seek them in the persons who kept up the various London chronicles. These are written from a purely local point of view, often in the form of mere annals, with the names of the mayor and sheriffs at the head of each year. The main part of them was edited in 1905 by Mr. C. Kingsford under the name of *Chronicles of London*. It is from these annals alone, supplemented by the *Proceedings of the Privy Council*, that we can glean some details of the strife between Beaufort and Gloucester, and of the slightly less obscure period which extends down to the outbreak of the Wars of the Roses. For a full discussion of the inter-relations of the seven chronicles, all of fifteenth century date, which form this series, the reader may be referred to Mr. Kingsford's lucid and invaluable preface: he prints three of the chronicles, all Cotton MSS. (Julius, B. II., Cleopatra, C. IV., and Vitellius, A. XVI.). Another, that generally known as *Gregory's Chronicle*, was edited by Dr. Gairdner for the Camden Society in 1876. A fifth (Harleian MS., 565) was printed by Sir Harris Nicolas in his *Chronicle of London* in 1827. It is fuller than the rest for the reign of Henry IV. The sixth chronicle, a mere list of names and dates down to 1445, swells out into considerable lengths of narration from that date to 1465: it was edited by Dr. Gairdner in the volume named *Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles* for the Camden Society in 1880. The seventh (Julius, B. I.), mainly a compilation from some of the others, has independent value only for the years 1423-25 and 1427-28. Its annals for these two short periods are printed as a supplement to Mr. Kingsford's book. The most interesting of the group is undoubtedly that which goes by the name of Gregory; but the best part of it was not written by Gregory Skinner himself, but by some continuator, who covered the years 1453-70. The writer of the

annals of these seventeen years, whoever he was, had a strong sense of humour and a merry wit. *Fabyan's Chronicle*, called by himself the *Consordance of Histories*, is mainly composed from several of the London chronicles, with screeds from Chastellain's *Chronique de Normandie*, so far as its fifteenth century portion is concerned. It goes down to 1485; Fabyan was sheriff of London in 1493. It has little independent value. Most of the London chronicles run dry before the death of Edward IV. Of the seven (excluding Fabyan) named above, the first stops at 1432, the second at 1443, the fourth (Gregory) at 1470, the fifth at 1443, the sixth at 1465. Only the third and seventh struggle on to Bosworth Field, and these are the weakest of the fraternity.

Outside the group of London chronicles there is a lamentable want of detailed narrative for the Wars of the Roses. The two best are WILLIAM OF WORCESTER, mentioned above, and the last *Continuator of the Croyland Chronicle*. William ends at 1468, leaving the obscure later years of Edward IV. untouched. But the anonymous Croyland writer goes down to 1486, and is invaluable as giving the only detailed contemporary narrative which exists of the period from 1471 to Bosworth. He is specially useful for the fall of Clarence and for the whole reign of Richard III., of which he has a rather spirited and well-written sketch. He is only accessible in the Oxford edition by Fulman (1684).

Short portions of the Wars of the Roses are covered by the following writers: JOHN WHETHAMSTED, Abbot of St. Albans, and last of all the historians bred in the abbey, wrote a *Registrum* of the years 1451-61. It has some value for the two battles fought under the abbey walls, but is disfigured by much bad Latin verse. The abbot's metrical invectives against the Lancastrian plunderers—

Gens Boreae, gens perfidiae, gens plena rapinae—

do not much assist us in drawing up serious history. JOHN WARKWORTH, Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge, is credited with a chronicle of the first thirteen years of Edward IV., with a distinct Lancastrian bias. This little work was published by the Camden Society (ed. Halliwell) in 1839. It is mainly notable for portents and marvels, comets and preternatural springs of water, mysterious voices crying in the air, and such-like stuff. An anonymous author of Yorkist tendencies, apparently a retainer of the Duke of Norfolk, has left a short chronicle of the years 1461-70, which ends abruptly in the middle of a sentence. It is full of information not elsewhere preserved, and its mutilated condition is much to be deplored. Its text

APP. I. only exists in Hearne's volume, *Thomae Sprot Chronica*, etc., published at Oxford in 1719. Hence it is often called *Hearne's Fragment*.

There stand by themselves two short chronicles which are obviously official documents, drawn up by order of Edward IV. to vindicate his acts. These are the *Chronicle of the Lincolnshire Rebellion* (*Camden Miscellany*, vol. i.), in which that rising is told in such a manner as to father all the troubles on Warwick and Clarence, and the *Arrival of King Edward IV.*, an admirable narrative of the campaigns of Barnet and Tewkesbury. The author (who describes himself as a member of the royal household) possessed the true military eye, and can describe a campaign and a battle in a way that none of his contemporaries can equal. The text was printed by the Camden Society (ed. John Bruce) in 1838. A contemporary French abridgment of it, *La Revolte du Conte de Warwick*, was printed (ed. J. A. Giles) by the same society in 1839.

For Richard III. we have of purely contemporary narrative only the *Croyland Continuator* above mentioned. But Sir THOMAS MORE'S *History of King Richard III.*, written in 1513 by the great chancellor from the reminiscences of his patron, Archbishop Morton, who played an important part in the affairs of 1483-85, gives invaluable information, and can be trusted in the main, despite of its natural Tudor bias. It is far more useful than the other authority of the same age which must sometimes be employed, the *Anglicae Historiae libri xvii.*, of the Italian historian, POLYDORUS VERGIL. This cleric was in England from 1505 to 1550, and wrote a complete history of England, of which three books cover the reigns of Edward IV. and V. and Richard III. It is scholarly and critical, but not sincere or impartial.

Of the foreign authorities for the period of the reigns of Henry VI. and the three Yorkist kings, MONSTRELET, who covers the section 1400-44, and JEAN LEFÈVRE, whose limits are 1408-35, give lengthy and detailed narratives. The latter sometimes borrows from the former, but is generally independent and always valuable. He was himself present at Agincourt, of which his account is perhaps the best existing, with the exception of that of the chaplain cited before. Bishop BASIN was of a younger generation, but well remembered the English domination, and gives many harrowing details of the state of northern France during his boyhood. His *Histoire de Charles VII.* was published by the *Société de l'histoire de France* in 1855. JEAN DE WAVRIN wrote a *Recueil des Chroniques et anciennes Histoires de la Grande Bretagne*, which has no value till about the year 1440. From thence onward it is useful for the relations of

France and Burgundy with England, though the domestic English annals are confused and often worthless—*e.g.*, there are two narratives of Blore Heath, which is made into a pair of battles. Wavrin, however, had met Warwick the king-maker, and seems to have got from him some interesting and authentic scraps of history. His annals stop at 1471. They were edited for the Rolls Series in five volumes by Sir W. and Mr. E. L. Hardy between 1864 and 1891. Another long French chronicle containing much matter relating to the English wars with France is that of GEORGES CHASTELLAIN, a dependant of Philip of Burgundy. It covers the years 1419 to 1471, and was published by Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove in eight volumes between 1863 and 1866. The *Mémoires* of the celebrated PHILIPPE DE COMINES start later (1464), and contain in their third and fourth books much valuable material concerning the dealings of Louis XI. and Charles the Bold with Edward IV., of whose ability Philip entertained a very poor opinion. Of editions of this famous work Mandrot's (1901-1903) is best. OLIVIER DE LA MARCHE'S *Mémoires* are also to be utilised for Anglo-Burgundian relations. This author was master of the household to Duke Philip the Good.

A number of short chronicles and other material relating to the end of the English domination in France were reprinted for the Rolls Series in 1863, by Joseph Stevenson, with the title *Narratives of the Expulsion of the English from Normandy, 1449-50*. They include ROBERT BLONDEL'S *De Reductione Normanniae* and BERRY HERALD'S *Recouvrement de Normandie*. By the same editor is *Letters and Papers relating to the Wars of the English in France* (Rolls Series, 1861-64). There is a whole literature on Jeanne Darc, starting with COUSINOT'S *Chronique de la Pucelle*, but it need not here be discussed.

Among Scottish and Irish chronicles, ANDREW OF WYNTOUN'S metrical *Origynale Chronikyl* covers the annals of Scotland down to 1408. A text will be found in the *Historians of Scotland*, ed. David Laing, 1872-79. The last two books of the *Liber Pluscardinensis* (x. and xi.) are good contemporary material for the relations of Scotland and England down to the murder of James I., and are particularly valuable for the doings of the Scots in France at Baugé, Verneuil, and other fights. This work was published in the *Historians of Scotland*, ed. F. Skene, 1888. WALTER BOWER'S continuation of the *Scotichronicon* to 1437, a very useful authority, has not been reprinted since W. Goodall's Edinburgh edition of 1759. HECTOR BOECE'S *Buik of Chroniclis* starts, like Wyntoun, from the earliest times, and goes down to the death of James II.; it was edited for the Rolls Series in 1859. The part dealing with the Lancastrian

APP. I. period is not the work of a contemporary, as Boece died in 1536. The same may be said of the continuation of this *Buik of Chronicleis* by FERERRIUS, which covers the years 1460-85, and for LINDSAY OF PITSCOTTIE'S history covering the same period. The Irish chronicles dealing with the fifteenth century are singularly dull and jejune; for the most part a mere tangle of names and dates. None of the authors rise to any conception of history as opposed to annals. Those covering the period are the *Annals of Loch Cé* (Rolls Series, ed. W. M. Hennessey, 1871), a Connaught chronicle going down to 1540; the *Annals of the Four Masters*, compiled from elder documents, some of which are lost, but only finished in 1616; and the *Annals of Ulster*, which goes down to 1498, and is continued by another hand to 1540 (ed. W. Hennessey and B. MacCarthy, Dublin, 1887-95).

Collections of Letters.—Of these the *Paston Letters*, whose definitive edition was published by Dr. James Gairdner in 1904, are far the most important. More can be learnt of the spirit of the fifteenth century by studying the familiar correspondence of this hard and unsympathetic race of Norfolk squires than by reading a dozen chronicles. The Pastons give us little detailed history: Barnet is mentioned by one member of the family merely with the note that he has received an arrow in the arm, and not a word of description. But they give us the atmosphere of the times: the constant litigation, the abuses of livery and maintenance, the local feuds and affrays, the family debts and distresses, the chaffering about lands and marriages. It is strange that only this single house has left such a memorial behind it: all the other collections of fifteenth century papers such as the *Cely Correspondence* or the *Plumpton Correspondence* (Camden Society, 1904 and 1839) are insignificant in comparison. All these are private letters. Of a more public and official sort are the following collections: HINGESTON'S *Royal and Historical Letters of the Reign of Henry IV.* (Rolls Series, 1860), Bishop BEKYNTON'S *Official Correspondence* (Rolls Series, 1872), and *Letters and Papers illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III. and Henry VII.*, ed. Dr. James Gairdner (Rolls Series, 1861-63). Numerous letters relating to the period 1377-1485 may also be found in the two collections of Sir Henry Ellis, *Original Letters illustrative of English History*, 1418-1726 (London, 1824), and of J. O. Halliwell, *Letters of the Kings of England from Richard I. to Charles I.* (London, 1846). Others relating mainly to the possessions of the English in France are in J. CHAMPOLLION-FIGEAC'S *Lettres des rois, reines, etc., de France et d'Angleterre* (Paris, 1839-47) in *Documents Inédits*.

Official Records.—The student will find an admirable digest of APP. L the various classes of material existing in manuscript, in the chapter on authorities in the preceding volume of this history, by Professor Tout. The only section of documents of which a large proportion has been catalogued are the *Patent Rolls*. Of these the *Calendar* has been published for the whole of the reign of Richard II., and for the whole of the period of the three Yorkist kings. But of Henry IV. only the years 1399-1405, and of Henry VI. only the years 1422-29 have yet been completed. The reign of Henry V. has not even been touched. Of the other sections of the *Record Office Publications* only the Venetian and Papal series have anything to show for the fifteenth century. In the former, Rawdon Brown's first volume, covering the years 1202-1509, has some useful material. In the latter, *Entries in Papal Registers illustrating the History of Great Britain*, ed. W. Bliss, and *Papal Letters IV. and V.*, ed. Bliss and Twemlow, may be consulted.

We are therefore thrown back, so far as printed material goes, on the old folios of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. RYMER'S *Foedera*, incomplete as it is, has still to be treated as a primary source for the times between 1377 and 1485. Part of volume iii., the whole of volume iv., and the first 165 pages of volume v. of the edition of 1741 contain the documents of these years. The *Inquisitiones Post Mortem*, edited 1821-28, give in their third and fourth volumes the reigns from Richard II. to Richard III., but the inventory is inaccurate and incomplete. They are invaluable as enabling us to trace the transference of landed property among the great houses, and make it possible to determine with accuracy where the lands of each important actor in the Wars of the Roses lay. Another most important official source is the *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, ed. Sir Harris Nicolas, 1834. There are six volumes extending from Richard II. (1386) down to the deposition of Henry VI. For the Yorkist reigns nothing is forthcoming.

More precious still are the parliamentary records, *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, 6 vols. (London, 1777, but without place or date on the title-pages), and *Statutes of the Realm, 1235-1713* (Record Commission, 1810-28, in 11 vols.). The special value of these, in this period, is that, owing to the dearth of good chronicles in its later half, there are numerous events of importance of which we have absolutely no record save in the petitions or statutes. The details of the Earl of Devon's sack of Exeter in 1455, for example, escaped the chroniclers completely, and are only narrated in the Rolls of Parliament. Other material available only in old and not always

APP. I. well-edited texts may be found in the following series. For Scotland, *Rotuli Scotiæ*, 1291-1516, two volumes of the Record Commission, 1814-19, contain documents dealing with the relations between England and Scotland. *Rotuli selecti ad res Anglicas et Hibernicas spectantes*, in the same series, 1834, has the letters patent of the Irish Exchequer for the years 1413-34. *Calendarium Rotulorum patentium et clausorum Cancellariæ Hiberniæ* goes down to Henry VII., and was published for the Irish Record Commission, Dublin, 1828. More modern are for Scotland the *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland*, 1108-1509, ed. Joseph Bain, 4 vols. (Edinburgh, 1881-88), and for France the *Calendar of French Rolls*, 1 Henry V. to 49 Henry VI. in the *Deputy Keeper's Reports*, xlv. and xlviii. (1883-87), the *Norman Rolls of Henry V.*, *ibid.*, xli. and xlii. (1880-81), and the *Rôles Normands et Français tirées des Archives de Londres* for Henry V. and VI., ed. Bréquigny (Paris, 1858). The relations of England with the Hanseatic League may be studied in Karl Kunze's two collections, *Hanseakten aus England* (Halle, 1891) and *Hansisches Urkundenbuch*, 1392-1414 (Halle, 1876).

The greatest gap in the series of printed records relating to this period is in the financial section. Indeed so few are the documents that have been printed, that the student must be referred to the financial abstracts of Sir JAMES RAMSAY in his *Lancaster and York* (Oxford, 1892), and in his *Accounts from Edward III. to Richard III.*, published in many numbers of the *Antiquary* between 1880 and 1888, as the most useful material to be procured. There are extracts, but extracts only, in F. DEVON'S *Issues of the Exchequer* (London, 1837). Sir Harris Nicolas printed in 1830 the *Wardrobe Accounts of King Edward IV.* and the *Privy Purse Expenses* of his queen, but only for the single year 1480. *The Lay Subsidy of London for 1411-12* was printed by J. C. L. Stahlschmidt in the *Journal of the Royal Archæological Institute* for 1887; that of Sussex for the same year in the *Sussex Archæological Society's Proceedings* for 1858. The famous poll-taxes of Richard II. have been edited for certain localities only—that of the second year for Shrewsbury, Bath, parts of Staffordshire and the West Riding of York; those of 1381 for parts of Suffolk, Essex, and Staffordshire, by various hands. A calendar of the material surviving for the latter tax exists in the appendix to C. OMAN'S *Great Revolt of 1381* (Oxford, 1906). An inventory of the *Accounts of the Duchy of Lancaster* may be found in the *Deputy Keeper's Reports*, vol. xlv. (1885).

A word must be added as to the sources for the ecclesiastical history of the period 1377-1485. The main interest hinges on the

Wycliffite movement, for, compared to this, the relations of England with the Papacy and the Councils of Constance and Basle, are of comparatively little importance. The growth of the reformer's views, political, social and dogmatic, can be studied in *The Select English Works of John Wycliffe*, ed. T. Arnold (Oxford, 1869-71); *The English Works of Wycliffe hitherto unprinted*, ed. F. D. Matthew (Early English Text Society, 1880); and still more in *Wyclif's Latin Works*, 25 vols., edited for the Wycliffe Society by Professor Loserth, Dr. R. L. Poole, and others (1883-99). His pupil JOHN PURVEY'S *Remonstrance Addressed to the People and Parliament of England in 1395*, was published by J. Forshall (London, 1851). Other Wycliffite treatises by later followers must have existed, but seem to have perished. Against the arguments of the reformer were written THOMAS NETTER OF WALDEN'S *Doctrinale Fidei Catholice contra Wiclefistas et Hussitas* (no edition later than that of Venice, 1757-59), and REGINALD PECOCK'S *Repressor of Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy* (ed. C. Babington, Rolls Series, 1860), which last involved the rationalising bishop in the troubles detailed on pages 377-8 of this book. But the most precious monument of the struggle between orthodoxy and reform is another work ascribed to NETTER, *Fasciculi Zizaniorum magistri Johannis Wyclif cum tritico* (ed. Shirley, Rolls Series, 1858), a series of documents, records of trials, short treatises, etc., with a connecting narrative, written about 1428. Netter was confessor to Henry V., and a bitter foe of the Lollards. For the later history of the persecuted sect we have no separate documents; facts have to be gleaned from the chronicles, episcopal registers, and local records. THOMAS GASCOIGNE'S *Loci e libro veritatum* (ed. J. Thorold Rogers, Oxford, 1881) gives copious details of Church abuses, though written by a champion of orthodoxy.

Records of municipal history in the fifteenth century are too numerous to allow of an attempt to name them in detail. Favourable examples of editing are the *Records of Reading* (1431-1654), ed. J. Guilding, 1892; *Records of Leicester* (vol. ii., 1327-1509), ed. Miss Mary Bateson, 1901; H. T. RILEY'S *Memorials of London, 1276-1419* (London, 1868); W. H. STEVENSON'S *Records of the Borough of Nottingham, 1155-1625* (London, 1882-89). With these may be mentioned local records of ecclesiastical administration, such as the *Ely Episcopal Records*, ed. A. Gibbons (Lincoln, 1891); the *Episcopal Records of the Diocese of Exeter*, ed. F. Hingston-Randolph; *Bishop Wykeham's Register, 1366-1404*, ed. T. Kirby (London, 1896-99), all full of material for this period.

The *political philosophy* of the fifteenth century may be studied

APP. I. in Sir JOHN FORTESCUE'S *De Laudibus Legum Angliae* and *The Governance of England*, written to glorify the limited and constitutional government of England as compared with continental despotism. The latter may be read in Mr. C. Plummer's excellent edition (Oxford, 1885); the former was edited by Lord Clermont in 1869. The *Libel of Englishe Policye*, a plea for "imperialism" as it was conceived in the reign of Henry VI., may be read in the pages of WRIGHT'S *Political Songs* (Rolls Series, 1861). But political thought has to be followed as much in the works of WYCLIFFE, in LANGLAND'S *Piers Plowman* (ed. W. W. Skeat, Oxford, 1887), and in GOWER'S *Vox Clamantis* or *Chronica Tripartita* (ed. G. S. Macaulay, Oxford, 1897), as in treatises devoted to constitutional matters. Religion and politics are inseparable. From *Piers Plowman* and the *Vox Clamantis* we are led on to other verse. Important for this period are T. WRIGHT'S *Political Poems and Songs relating to English History from Edward III. to Richard III.* above mentioned, F. MADDEN'S *Political Poems of the Reigns of Henry VI. and Edward IV.* (in *Archæologia*, 1842), and the Welsh poems of LEWIS OF GLYN COTHI, a contemporary of the Wars of the Roses, to which he makes much allusion. There are several historical ballads in the *Bishop Percy Folio Manuscript Ballads and Romances* (ed. J. W. Hales and F. J. Furnival, 1868) that give useful information as to the end of these wars, notably those called *Bosworth Feilde* and *The Ladie Bessie*, which were written before 1500 by a dependant of Lord Stanley, and give many details as to the campaign of 1485. *The Rose of England* in F. J. CHILD'S *Collection of Ballads*, part vi., is another and shorter poem on the same topic, the fall of Richard III.

A few paragraphs will suffice to deal with the modern authorities who treat of the period 1377-1485. It has been much neglected by historians, mainly, no doubt, because of the poorness of the chronicles, and the fact that the official documents in the Record Office remain for the most part unprinted. The entire period is covered by the fifth volume of R. PAULI'S meritorious *Geschichte von England* (Hamburg, 1858), which has never been translated. There is no modern history of the reign of Richard II. in English. The sole writer who has dealt with it as a whole is M. HENRI WALLON, whose *Histoire de Richard II.* (Paris, 1864), with all its merits, is forty years old, and was published, like Pauli's work, before the discovery of many important documents, and even whole chronicles (e.g., Adam of Usk and the *Anonimal Chronicle of St. Mary's, York*), which are now available. There is a vigorous and interesting account of the first years of Richard (1377-83) in Mr. G. M. TREVELYAN'S *England in the Age of Wycliffe*. The insurrection of 1381 has a small literature

of its own. The most important authority for it is A. RÉVILLE, APP. I *Souèvement des Travailleurs d'Angleterre*, which contains a large collection of documents, and a monograph on the rising in Norfolk, Suffolk, and Herts, with a fine general preface on the rebellion by Professor C. PETIT-DUTAILLIS (Paris, 1898). EDGAR POWELL'S *Rising in East Anglia in 1381* consists of a short narrative of the troubles in that region, with appendices of documents (Cambridge, 1895). C. OMAN'S *Great Revolt of 1381* (Oxford, 1906) has a general account of the rising, with reprints of certain poll-tax rolls and other contemporary material. Bishop Despenser's *Flemish Crusade of 1383* is the subject of a small but interesting volume by G. Wrong (London, 1892). Of biographies dealing with this reign there need be cited only Dean HOOK'S *Lives of Sudbury, Courtenay, and Arundel* in his *Archbishops of Canterbury*, G. H. MOBERLY'S *Life of William of Wykeham* (London, 1887), S. ARMITAGE-SMITH'S *John of Gaunt* (London, 1904), an invaluable corrective against Walsingham's misrepresentations, and several biographies of Wycliffe. Of these last LECHLER'S *Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation* (Leipzig, 1873), J. LOSERTH'S *Hus und Wyclif* (Prague, 1884), and R. L. POOLE'S *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform* (1889) will be found most useful by the student. The later history of the Lollards is dealt with in the last chapter of TREVELYAN'S *Age of Wycliffe* mentioned above. JOHN FOXE made many excerpts concerning them in his celebrated *Acts and Monuments of the Church*, but his statements require controlling. For general ecclesiastical history, Canon W. CAPES'S *History of the English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (London, 1900), in Stephens' and Hunt's *History of the English Church*, may be used.

Passing on to the fifteenth century, we have a complete modern history of the period in Sir JAMES RAMSAY'S *Lancaster and York* (Oxford, 1892), a work of immense value to the student, especially for its minute inquiries into matters of revenue, but wanting in general views, and often wrong on military matters. On a larger scale is WYLIE'S *History of Henry IV.* (London, 1884-98), a work of admirable and minute research, but a little wanting in proportion and over-given to digression. C. L. KINGSFORD'S *Life of Henry V.* (London, 1902) is good. The king's early life is dealt with in F. SOLLY-FLOOD'S *Story of Prince Henry and Chief Justice Gascoigne* (*Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, 1886). Agincourt may be studied in Sir HARRIS NICOLAS'S monograph (London, 1853); the later campaigns in France down to 1453 in G. DU FRESNE DE BEAUCOURT'S *Histoire de Charles VII.* (Paris, 1881-91). PUISEUX'S *Siège de Rouen* and his *Colonisation Anglaise en Normandie au xv^{me} siècle*, are good monographs


APP. I. (Caen, 1866-67). For the times of Henry VI. far the most valuable modern commentary is the copious introduction and notes to Dr. JAMES GAIRDNER'S edition of the *Paston Letters*. For the later part of Henry's reign useful information will be found in M. A. HOOKHAM'S *Life and Times of Margaret of Anjou* (London, 1872), though the book is a little antiquated. There is a biography of Warwick the king-maker by C. OMAN (London, 1891), and one of Bishop Morton of Ely, by R. J. WOODHOUSE (London, 1895). The series of HOOK'S *Archbishops* continues to be useful. For the relations of England and Burgundy during the reign of Edward IV. the student may employ *The History of Charles the Bold*, by J. F. KIRK (London, 1863-68). Richard III. has not lacked his defenders. HORACE WALPOLE'S *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of Richard III.* (London, 1768) is only one of several attempts to discredit the generally received opinions. Sir Clements Markham in the *English Historical Review* for 1891 even tried to make out that it was Henry VII. who murdered the princes in the Tower! His fallacies were exposed in the same periodical by Dr. James Gairdner, whose *Life and Reign of Richard III.* (Cambridge, 1898, revised edition) cannot be too highly praised.

Of books not directly concerned with political history, Bishop STUBBS'S *Constitutional History of England* (revised edition of 1895-97) is the most important. The author was at his best in dealing with the later Middle Ages, and it will be long before his volume iii., dealing with the "Lancastrian Experiment" and the Yorkist reaction, is superseded. Some interesting constitutional points will be found worked out in Mr. Plummer's preface and notes to FORTESCUE'S *Governance of England* mentioned above. Social history may be studied in W. DENTON'S *England in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1888), and in Mrs. J. R. GREEN'S *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1894). Several of the works of THOROLD ROGERS, *The History of Agriculture and Prices* (1884), *The Economic Interpretation of History* (1888), and the *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* (1890), contain much material dealing with this period, and many valuable collections of figures, but his theories are often based on an insufficient array of facts, and the facts themselves are not always correctly stated. For trade the student may refer to Dr. W. CUNNINGHAM'S *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* (revised edition, Cambridge, 1905). University life may be studied in Dr. H. RASHDALL'S *Universities of the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. (Oxford, 1895), H. C. MAXWELL-LYTE'S *History of the University of Oxford to 1530* (London, 1886), and J. BASS MULLINGER'S *History of the University of Cambridge to 1535* (London, 1873).

APPENDIX II.

I.—THE HOUSES OF LANCASTER, BEAUFORT. AND HOLLAND.


EDWARD III., = Philippa of Hainault.
1327-77.



NOTE.—* = Murdered. † = Executed. ‡ = Killed in battle. d. = Died.


D. = Duke. M. = Marquis. E. = Earl. C. = Count or Countess. ↓ = Leaving surviving issue. Many persons of no historical importance are omitted.

BOURCHIER.



archbishop. C. = Countess. ↓ = Leaving surviving issue.

II.—THE HOUSES OF MARCH, YORK, BUCKINGHAM, AND BOURCHIER.



NOTE.—* = Murdered. † = Executed. ‡ = Killed in battle. o.s.p. = Obiit vita patris. d. = Died. D. = Duke. E. = Earl. Abp. = Archbishop. C. = Countess. ↓ = Leaving surviving issue.
Many persons of no historical importance are omitted.

INDEX.

- Aberdaron, convention of, 201.
 Aberystwith, first siege of, 209; captured by Prince Henry, 213.
 Acton, Sir Roger, executed, 237.
 Agincourt, battle of, 252-257.
 Albany, Alexander, Duke of, allies himself to Edward IV., 464, 466, 467; to Richard III., 487.
 Albany, Murdoch, Duke of, Earl of Fife, captured at Homildon, 177; ransomed, 243; regent, 293; beheaded, 294.
 Albany, Robert, Duke of, 167, 175, 204, 243.
 Albret, Charles, Sire de, constable, commands French army at Agincourt, 251; slain, 257.
 Alençon, Jean, Duke of, slain at Agincourt, 256, 257.
 Alençon, Jean (2), Duke of, taken prisoner at Verneuil, 295; commands at Patay, 308; raises the *Praguerie*, 331; invades Normandy, 341.
 Aljubarotta, battle of, 92, 97.
 Alnwick, sieges of, 413, 414, 416, 417.
 Angus, George, Earl of, 414, 416.
 Angus, Archibald, Earl of, "Bell the Cat," 466.
 Anne of Beaujeu, Regent of France, aids Henry Tudor, 488, 491.
 Anne of Bohemia, queen of Richard II., 66, 111, 125.
 Anne of Burgundy, wife of John, Duke of Bedford, 290, 318.
 Anne Neville, queen of Richard III., marries Edward of Lancaster, 438; marries Richard, Duke of Gloucester, 452; dies, 490.
 Appellant, the Lords, 105-112; Richard's revenge on, 133-137.
 Armagnac, Bernard, Count of, constable of France, 261, 264; murdered, 268.
 Arras, conference of, 321, 322.
 Artevelde, Philip van, Regent of Flanders, 80; defeated and slain at Roosebeke, 83.
 Arundel, Sir John, shipwrecked, 18.
 Arundel, John, Earl of, in French war, 319; killed, 321.
 Arundel, Richard, Earl of, 3, 6, 7, 12, 18, 49, 67, 68; Richard's quarrel with, 90, 99; one of the Lords Appellant, 105-111; high admiral, 111; attacks Lancaster, 122, 125; arrested and executed, 134-136.
 Arundel, Thomas, Earl of, lands with Henry of Lancaster, 147; tries Scrope, 197; commands expedition to France, 223, 224; treasurer to Henry V., 232.
 Arundel, William, Earl of, Yorkist, 400.
 Arundel, Thomas, Bishop of Ely, chancellor, 102; at the "merciless parliament," 109; Archbishop of York, 111, 116, 121, 128; Archbishop of Canterbury, 131; arrested and banished, 136, 137; lands with Henry of Lancaster, 147; reinstated as archbishop, 150, 156; persecutes Lollards, 171, 220, 233; tries to save Scrope, 197; chancellor of Henry IV., 205, 209, 225; dismissed by Henry V., 232; attacks Cobham, 234, 235; death, 239.
 Aston, John, follower of Wycliffe, tried and imprisoned, 77.
 Aston, Sir Richard, defeats the French at Calais, 194.
 Audley, James, Lord, killed at Blore Heath, 380, 381.
 Audley, John, Lord, Yorkist, 389, 390.
 Aumerle. See York.
 Ayscough, William, Bishop of Salisbury, murdered, 350.
 Bacon, Sir Roger, Norfolk rebel, 54, 56, 57, 60.
 Badby, John, Lollard martyr, 222, 223.
 Bagot, Sir William, confidant of Richard II., 147, 148, 158, 160.
 Ball, John, joins Tyler, 36; his teaching, 39; executed, 51.
 Bamborough, sieges of by Yorkists, 413-417.

- Bampton, Thomas, commissioner of poll-tax, 33.
- Bardolph, Thomas, Lord, joins Percy's rebellion, 194, 211; killed at Bramham Moor, 212.
- Barnet, battle of, 444, 445.
- Baugé, battle of, 280, 281.
- Bayonne, siege of, 12; taken by French, 359.
- Beauchamp, Richard, Bishop of Salisbury, Yorkist, 382, 392.
- Beaufort, Henry, Bishop of Lincoln, 143; chancellor, 186; Bishop of Winchester, 192; character of, 218; partisan of Henry, Prince of Wales, 225; chancellor of Henry V., 241; opposes Gloucester, 288, 297, 299; cardinal, 300, 309; at trial of Jeanne Darc, 313; at Arras, 321, 322; tries the Duchess of Gloucester, 332; dies, 339.
- Beaufort, John, killed at Tewkesbury, 447.
- Beaufort, John, Thomas, Edward. See Somerset and Exeter.
- Beaufort, Lady Joan, marries James I. of Scotland, 293.
- Beaufort, Lady Margaret, 334, 355, 448, 484, 486.
- Bedford, George Neville, Duke of, 435.
- Bedford, Jacqueline, Duchess of, 319, 403, 422, 435.
- Bedford, John, Duke of, 196, 239; administers England, 243, 264, 267; regent of France, 284; of England, 288; his character, 289; carries on the war in France, 290-295; returns to England, 297; opposes Jeanne Darc, 310; condemns her, 315, 316; his last campaign in France, 319-321; death, 323.
- Belknap, Robert, chief justice, 33, 50; signs Opinions of Nottingham, 104; exiled, 111.
- Bergerac, taken by French, 6.
- Berry, John, Duke of, raises civil war in France, 223, 228.
- Berton, William, chancellor of the university of Oxford, inhibits Wycliffe, 75.
- Berwick, surrendered to the Scots by Henry VI., 409; given back to Edward IV., 466.
- Bible, the, translated by Wycliffe, 73-75.
- Billericay, combat of, 50.
- Black Death, the, its effect on the price of labour, 27.
- Blanchard, Alain, defends Rouen, 270, 272.
- Blanche, daughter of Henry IV., married to Lewis, son of the Emperor Rupert, 169, 174.
- Blore Heath, battle of, 380, 381.
- Bona, Princess of Savoy, 422.
- Bonville, William, Lord, his quarrel with the Earl of Devon, 371; Yorkist, 401; executed, 403.
- Bordeaux, first capture of by French, 359; second capture, 360.
- Bosworth Field, battle of, 493-496.
- Bourchier, Lord. See Essex.
- Bourchier, Thomas, Archbishop, 363, 369, 371; condemns Bishop Pecock for heresy, 378, 391, 396, 478, 480.
- Bourg, siege of, 206-207.
- Bourratier, Pierre, Archbishop of Bourges, ambassador to Henry V., 244.
- Bouteiller, Sir Guy le, governor of Rouen, 270-272; governor of Paris, 290.
- Brabant, John, Duke of, 292.
- Brakenbury, Robert, governor of the Tower, 481; slain at Bosworth, 496-498.
- Bramber, Nicholas, citizen of London, knighted by Richard II. after Tyler's death, 48; mayor of London, 88; partisan of Richard, 101, 105; condemned and executed by Merciless Parliament, 111.
- Bramham Moor, battle of, 212.
- Brantingham, Thomas, Bishop of Exeter, treasurer, 18; resigns, 22; again treasurer, 116.
- Brentwood, riots at, 33.
- Brest, ceded to English, 10; returned to Brittany, 133.
- Brezé, Pierre de, aids Queen Margaret, 413-415.
- Brittany, Francis, Duke of, receives enemies of Richard III., 488.
- Brittany, John, Duke of, allied to England, 10, 18; makes peace with France, 20.
- Brittany, wars in, 17, 19, 20, 114.
- Buchan, John Stewart, Earl of, 279; wins battle of Baugé, 280; slain at Verneuil, 295.
- Buckingham, Henry, Duke of, tries Clarence, 463; partisan of Richard III., 474, 479, 480; rebels against Richard, 482; executed, 485.
- Buckingham, Humphrey, Duke of, Lancastrian, 367, 372, 373; defeated and slain at Northampton, 392, 393.
- Buckingham, Thomas, Earl of. See Gloucester.
- Burdett, Roger, retainer of Clarence, executed, 461.
- Burgundy, Charles, Duke of, 425; seeks alliance with Yorkists, 427; marries Margaret, sister of Edward IV., 427-429; aids Edward IV., 441, 454, 456;

- betrayed by Edward, 458; death of, 461.
- Burgundy, John, Duke of, his feuds with Orleans, 206-211, 223, 224, 239, 241; alliance with England, 241, 263; attacks Paris, 264-266; breaks faith with Henry V., 269, 270, 272; makes treaty with the dauphin, 274; slain, 275.
- Burgundy, Philip le Hardi, Duke of, 96, 114.
- Burgundy, Philip le Bon, Duke of, allies himself with England, 275, 278, 291; his quarrel with Gloucester, 296; receives Picardy from Bedford, 314, 318; passes over to the French, 321; fails at Calais, 326; concludes truce with England, 331; aids Yorkists, 413, 421, 425; dies, 428.
- Burley, Sir Simon, 34; warden of Dover Castle, 88; partisan of Richard II., 105; arrested by Lords Appellant, 109; executed, 111.
- Bury St. Edmunds, revolt in, 54, 60.
- Bushy, Sir John, tool of Richard II., 35, 136, 139, 141, 146; executed, 149.
- Cade, Jack, rebellion of, 347-350.
- Caen, taken by Henry V., 265; surrendered by Somerset, 344.
- Calais, besieged by John of Burgundy, 207; by Philip of Burgundy, 326; Warwick at, 369, 371, 387-390, 433.
- Cambridge, Richard, Earl of, his conspiracy and execution, 245, 246.
- Cambridge, riots in, 58-60.
- Camoys, Thomas, Lord, at Agincourt, 253.
- Cardiff, taken by Glendower, 185.
- Castile, claims of John of Gaunt on, 5; expedition of Sir Thomas Trivet in, 12; makes peace with Portugal, 87; renewed war with Portugal, 92; Lancaster's campaign in, 117; peace with, 118.
- Castile, Juan and Enrique of Trastámara, Kings of. See their names.
- Castillon, battle at, 359, 360.
- Catesby, Sir William, partisan of Richard III., 489, 490, 496.
- Cauchon, Pierre, Bishop of Beauvais, tries Jeanne Darc, 315, 316.
- Cave, Robert, Kentish rebel, 34, 51.
- Caxton, his Westminster press, 469, 470.
- Charles V., King of France, at war with England, 4, 10, 12; dies, 19.
- Charles VI., King of France, defeats van Artevelde, 82; checks the Flemish crusade, 85; proposes to invade England, 100; his madness, 125, 129, 130, 224, 228, 273, 277; dies, 288.
- Charles VII., King of France, dauphin, 264; claims the regency, 269; murders Burgundy, 275; his incapacity, 279, 289; receives Jeanne Darc, 305; crowned at Reims, 309, 310, 316; enters Paris, 326; in Guienne, 332; in Normandy, 342-344.
- Charolais. See Burgundy, Charles of.
- Chartres, sieges of, 281, 318.
- Château Gaillard, taken by Henry V., 273; sieges of, 316, 342.
- Cheney, Sir John, Speaker, 157, 217.
- Clarence, George, Duke of, 409; marries Isabel of Warwick, 426, 429, 433, 439, 440; joins Edward IV., 443; at Barnet, 444; at Tewkesbury, 447, 452; quarrels with Edward IV., 460, 462; death, 463.
- Clarence, Thomas, Duke of, 215, 225; his fruitless expedition to France, 216, 217; in Normandy, 265, 268, 280; slain at Baugé, 281.
- Clarendon, Sir Roger, executed, 176.
- Clifford, John, Lord, Lancastrian, 397, 402; killed at Towton, 407.
- Cobham, Edward, Lord, Yorkist, 391, 401.
- Cobham, Eleanor. See Gloucester.
- Cobham, Lord (Sir John Oldcastle), 217, 222, 223; accused of Lollardy, 234-236; his rising, 236-238, 245, 261, 267; taken and executed, 267.
- Collingbourne, William, executed by Richard III., 489.
- Constance, council of, 243, 262.
- Conway, captured by Welsh rebels, 173.
- Conyers, Sir John, "Robin of Redesdale," 432, 434.
- Courtenay, Peter, Bishop of Exeter, rebels against Richard III., 484, 491.
- Courtenay, Richard, chancellor of Oxford, resists Archbishop Arundel, 221.
- Courtenay, William, Bishop of London, 3; obtains respite for John Ball, 51; tries Wycliffe, 69, 71; archbishop, 76; holds synod of Blackfriars, 76; quarrels with Richard II., 94; opposes clerical taxation, 97.
- Coventry, parliaments of, 190, 384, 385.
- Cromwell, Ralph, Lord, 319, 346, 369.
- Crusade, the Flemish, 81-86.
- De la Mare, Peter, Speaker, 1, 2, 7.
- De la Mare, Thomas, Abbot of St. Albans, 52.
- Derby, Henry, Earl of. See Henry IV.
- Despenser, Constance, Lady, her plot against Henry IV., 193.
- Despenser, Henry, Bishop of Norwich, quells Norfolk rebellion, 58-60; leads the Flemish crusade, 82, 83, 85, 86.

- Despenser, Thomas, Lord. See Gloucester.
- Devon, Hugh Courtenay, Earl of, slain at Tewkesbury, 447.
- Devon, Humphrey Stafford, Earl of, supports Edward IV., 434; executed by Warwick, 435.
- Devon, Thomas Courtenay (1), Earl of, 358; his quarrel with Bonville, 371.
- Devon, Thomas Courtenay (2), Earl of, Lancastrian, 397, 407, 408.
- Dieppe, siege of, 332.
- Dorset, John Beaufort, Marquis of. See Somerset.
- Dorset, Thomas Beaufort, Marquis of. See Exeter.
- Dorset, Thomas Grey, Marquis of, son of Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV., 457, 463, 464, 474; conspires against Richard III., 48; takes refuge in Brittany, 488.
- Douglas, Archibald (1), Earl of, 167, 172.
- Douglas, Archibald (2), Earl of, captured at Homildon, 177; joins the Percies, 180; captured at Shrewsbury, 182; in France, 291; slain at Verneuil, 295.
- Douglas, James (1), Earl of, slain at Otterbourne, 115.
- Douglas, James (2), Earl of, aids Albany, 464, 487.
- Douglas, Sir William, his "Foul Raid," 267.
- Dudley, John, Lord, imprisoned by York, 351; prisoner at St. Albans, sent to the Tower, 368, 381.
- Dunbar, surrendered to English, 167; recovered by Scots, 168.
- Dunois, Bastard of Orleans, 300; defends Orleans, 303-307; at St. Denis, 322; his exploits, 329, 342, 344, 358.
- Dunstanburgh, sieges of, by Yorkists, 414, 417.
- Edinburgh, captured by John of Gaunt, 88; by Richard II., 95; by Richard III., 466.
- Edgcott, battle of, 434.
- Edward III., death of, 1.
- Edward IV., Earl of March, 381, 387, 390; at Northampton, 393; wins battle of Mortimer's Cross, 404; proclaimed king, 405; wins battle of Towton, 407-408; crowned at Westminster, 409; character of, 419; marriage of to Elizabeth Grey, 422; breach with Warwick, 425-432; taken prisoner by Warwick, 434; forces Warwick to fly, 437; takes refuge with Charles Duke of Burgundy, 440; lands in England, 441-443; wins battle of Barnet, 444; of Tewkesbury, 447; his character and government, 450-455; his French war, 456-458; makes treaty of Picquigny with Louis XI., 458-459; imprisons and executes Clarence, 462, 463; his Scottish war, 465-467; death, 468.
- Edward V., 443; accession of, 471; murdered, 481.
- Edward, Prince of Wales, son of Henry VI., 361, 362; declared heir to the throne, 385, 392; at St. Albans, 403; flight after Ryle, 415; marries Anne Neville, 438; slain at Tewkesbury, 447.
- Edward, Prince of Wales, son of Richard III., 486, 487.
- Elizabeth Grey or Woodville, queen of Edward IV., 422; takes sanctuary at Westminster, 440, 474; reconciled with Richard III., 486.
- Elizabeth of York, daughter of Edward IV., 425; betrothed to George Neville, 435; conspiracy on behalf of, 483; designs of Richard III. concerning, 489.
- Enrique I. of Trastamara, King of Castile, at war with England, 5, 6, 12.
- Enrique II. of Castile, marries Katharine of Lancaster, 117-118.
- Epinay, combat of, 326.
- Essex, Henry Bouchier, Earl of, Yorkist, 356, 369, 371, 391, 394, 401, 409, 473.
- Essex, rebellion of 1381 in, 33, 37, 50.
- Eton founded by Henry VI., 336.
- Exeter, John Holland, Duke of, Earl of Huntingdon, his misdeeds, 91, 95; sent to Spain, 98; one of Richard's Lords Appellant, 135-137; degraded from rank of duke, 159; conspires against Henry IV., 161; slain, 164.
- Exeter, Henry Holland, Duke of, partisan of Somerset, 364; Lancastrian, 397, 402, 407, 415; wounded at Barnet, 445; imprisoned and dies, 449.
- Exeter, Thomas Beaufort, Marquis of Dorset, Duke of, character of, 218; chancellor, 219, 250; in France, 268; guardian of Henry VI., 284; opposes Gloucester, 288; dies, 300.
- Exeter, sacked by Earl of Devon, 371.
- Falaise, siege of, 266; recovered by French, 344.
- Farringdon, Thomas, leader of Essex rioters, 37, 41, 51.
- Fauconberg, Thomas, bastard of, supporter of Warwick, 441, 445, 448, 449.
- Fauconberg, William Neville, Lord, See Kent.

- Felton, Sir Thomas, defeated and captured by French, 6.
- Fernando, King of Portugal, 19, 87.
- Fife, Murdoch, Earl of. See Albany.
- Flanders, civil wars of, 80-83; English crusade in, 80-85; invaded by Gloucester, 327.
- Formigny, battle of, 343.
- Fotheringhay, treaty of, 465.
- Fougères, sack of, 341.
- Gascoigne, Sir William, refuses to try Scrope, 197; removed by Henry V., 232.
- Gaunt, John of. See Lancaster.
- Gerberoi, battle of, 321.
- Glendower, Owen, his raids on the Welsh frontier, 168; his estates confiscated, 169; rebellion of, 173, 176, 178, 179, 184, 189, 194, 199, 203, 206, 209, 212, 215, 243; dies, 238, 260.
- Gloucester, Constance, Countess of. See Despenser.
- Gloucester, Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of, 296; tried for sorcery, 332-333.
- Gloucester, Humphrey, Duke of, 239; in Normandy, 268; regent of England, 284, 287; marries Jacqueline of Hainault, 292; his expedition to Hainault, 296; quarrels with Beaufort, 297-299, 312, 317; intrigues of, 317-318; commands at Calais, 325-326; succumbs to the Beauforts, 332, 333; his arrest and death, 338; his memory cleared, 370; his scholarship, 467.
- Gloucester, Jacqueline, Duchess of, 292, 296, 297.
- Gloucester, Richard, Duke of. See Richard III.
- Gloucester, Thomas, Earl of Buckingham, Duke of, his expedition to Brittany, 19, 20, 49, 50; created Duke of Gloucester, 95; his intrigues against Richard II., 99, 101-105; leader of the Lords Appellant, 106; at Radcot Bridge, 108; at the "merciless parliament," 109-112; his rule, 113-116; supplanted by Lancaster, 116; arrested, 134; murdered, 135.
- Gloucester, parliament of, 14, 15.
- Gough, Sir Matthew, at Formigny, 343; slain, 349.
- Grey, Elizabeth, Lady. See Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV.
- Grey, Richard, Lord, son of Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV., seized by Richard III., 474; executed, 480.
- Grey of Ruthyn, Edmund, Lord. See Kent.
- Grey of Ruthyn, Reginald, Lord, his quarrel with Glendower, 168-169; captured by Glendower, 174.
- Grey, Sir Ralph, treachery of, 414; executed, 417.
- Grey, Sir Thomas, conspires against Henry V., executed, 246.
- Grey, Thomas, Lord, son of Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV. See Dorset.
- Grindcob, William, leader of the revolt in St. Albans, 52.
- Guesclin, Bertrand du, constable, 4, 10, 11, 19.
- Guienne, defence of, against the French, 4-6, 12, 96; John of Gaunt made duke of, 120, 206-207; French invasion of, 330-332; French reconquer, 358-360.
- Gurney, Sir Matt., defends Bayonne, 12.
- Hales, Sir Robert, treasurer, 22; murdered, 43.
- Harfleur, captured by Henry V., 249; later sieges of, 329, 342.
- Harlech, taken by Glendower, 189; recovered by Prince Henry, 213; held for Lancastrians, 397, 430.
- Hastings, burnt by the French, 6.
- Hastings, William, Lord, Yorkist, 413, 440, 444, 447, 458, 464, 469, 474; executed by Richard III., 477.
- Hately Field. See Shrewsbury.
- Haule, Robert, slain in Westminster Abbey, 14.
- Hausa, the quarrel of Edward IV. with, 455.
- Haxey's Case, 132.
- Hedgeley Moor, battle of, 416.
- Henry IV., Earl of Derby, 105; joins Lords Appellants, 107; at Radcot Bridge, 108; Duke of Hereford, 137; quarrel with Mowbray and banishment, 141-143; estates confiscated, 145; lands at Ravenspur, 147; forces Richard II. to abdicate, 149; claims the throne, 152; puts down rebellion of Kent and Salisbury, 162-164; his Scottish war, 167, 168; expeditions against Owen Glendower, 173-176, 184; marries Joan of Navarre, 174; defeats Hotspur at Shrewsbury, 181-182; his expenditure controlled by parliament, 187-189; crushes Northumberland's rebellion, 197-199; accepts the thirty-one articles, 207-208; illness and final years of, 214-229; death, 229.
- Henry V. of Monmouth, 155; at Shrewsbury, 181-183; wins battle of Usk, 194; his wars in Wales, 202, 206, 209, 213; persecutes Lollards, 208, 217, 222; quarrels of, with his father, 225-227; accession of, 231; his character and policy, 232-234; persecutes Lollards, 234-236, 238; crushes Cobham's rising, 237-238; claims French throne, 240;

- his French war, 243-259; at Agincourt, 251-258; second invasion of France, 264; marries Katharine of France, 278; enters Paris, 279; returns to England, 280; third invasion of France, 281-282; illness and death, 283, 284; character, 285-286.
- Henry VI. of Windsor, 283; King of England, 287; of France, 288; crowned at Westminster, 312; crowned at Paris, 316; marries Margaret of Anjou, 335; character, 336; influence of Somerset over, 337-350, 352, 355; madness of, 361; recovers, 364; at St. Albans, 367; second madness and recovery, 370; raises army against York, 283; taken prisoner at Northampton, 393; regains freedom at St. Albans, 403; defeated at Towton, 409; in Scotland, 415; captured by Edward IV., 425; restored by Warwick, 440; imprisoned by Edward IV., 443; murdered, 449.
- Henry VII. See Richmond.
- Herbert, William, Lord. See Pembroke.
- Hereford, Nicholas, Lollard, 75-77, 79.
- Heretico comburendo, de*, statute of, 171.
- Herrings, battle of the, 343.
- Hexham, battle of, 417.
- Hilyard, Robert. See Holderness.
- Holderness, Robin of, Lancastrian, 432.
- Holland, Sir John. See Exeter.
- Holland, Thomas, Lord. See Kent and Surrey.
- Hornildon Hill, battle of, 176-177.
- Horn, John, London alderman, aids Tyler, 38, 45; tried and imprisoned, 51.
- Horn, John, follower of Wycliffe, 79.
- Hotspur. See Percy.
- Howard, John, Lord. See Norfolk.
- Huntingdon, John Holland, Earl of. See Exeter.
- Huss, John, burnt, 262.
- Income tax, raised by Henry IV., 188; by Edward IV., 453.
- Ireland, Richard II. in, 125-128, 145-147; Richard, Duke of York, in, 340, 386.
- Isabeau, queen of Charles VI. of France, allied to Burgundy and England, 266, 273, 277.
- Isabella of France, second wife of Richard II., 129, 130, 161; restored to France, 172.
- Jacqueline of Hainault, marries Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, 292; captured by Burgundians, 296; her later adventures, 298, 299.
- Jacquette. See Bedford, Duchess of.
- James I. of Scotland, a prisoner in England, 203; with Henry V. in France, 278; returns to Scotland, 294; war with England, 327; murdered, 327.
- James II. of Scotland, 328; attacks Berwick, 370; slain at Roxburgh, 394.
- James III. of Scotland, war of Edward IV. with, 464-466; war of Richard III. with, 487.
- Jeanne Darc, her character and mission, 305, 306; delivers Orleans, 307; her second campaign, 308; at Reims, 309; wounded at Paris, 310; her influence wanes, 310; captured at Compiègne, 314; her trial and execution, 315-316.
- Joan Beaufort, queen of James I. of Scotland, 293.
- Joan of Navarre, queen of Henry IV., 174; accused of conspiracy against Henry V., imprisoned, 276-277; pardoned, 283; dies, 329.
- Joan, Princess of Wales. See Wales.
- João I., King of Portugal, 92; wins battle of Aljubarotta, 97, 98; marries Philippa of Lancaster, 117; makes peace with Spain, 118.
- John, Dauphin of France, joins Burgundy, 263; dies, 264.
- John of Gaunt. See Lancaster.
- Juan of Trastamara, King of Castile, defeated at Aljubarotta, 97, 98; fights against Lancaster, 117; makes peace, 118.
- Katharine of France, married to Henry V., 278; her marriage to Owen Tudor and death, 329.
- Katharine of Lancaster, marries Enrique of Castile, 118.
- Kells, combat of, 146.
- Kemp, John, Archbishop, chancellor, 300, 318, 321, 328, 333, 349, 351; dies, 363.
- Kent, Edmund Grey of Ruthyn, Earl of, murders Tresham, 351; betrays Lancastrians, 393, 424.
- Kent, outbreak of the rebellion of 1381 in, 34; Cade's rising in, 346-350.
- Kent, Thomas Holland, Earl of. See Surrey.
- Kent, William Neville, Lord Fauconberg, Earl of, Yorkist, 387, 390, 393, 407.
- Knowles, Sir Robert, restores order in London, 49.
- Kyriel, Sir Thomas, defeated at Formigny, 343; beheaded at St. Albans, 403.

- Labourers, condition of after the Black Death, 27; statute of, 15, 27, 31; re-imposed, 114; abolition of, demanded by Jack Cade, 347.
- La Fayette, Marshal, defends Caen, 265; commands French at Bauge, 280.
- La Hire, French commander, 308, 321, 324, 329.
- Lancaster, John of Gaunt, Duke of, 1-3; claims throne of Castile, 5, 7, 9; St. Malo expedition, 10-12; hatred of the commons for, 39; attempted insurrection in his name, 61; restored to favour at court, 65; withdraws aid from Wycliffe, 76, 77; negotiates truce with France, 87; his Scottish expedition, 88; his quarrel with the king, 90-93; his campaign in Spain, 98, 117; recalled by Richard, 117, created Duke of Guienne, 120; quarrels with Arundel, 122, 123; death, 145; his estates confiscated, 145.
- Landois, Peter, betrays Henry of Richmond, 488.
- Langstrother, Sir John, treasurer, 435, 444; executed after Tewkesbury, 447-448.
- Latimer, George Neville, Lord, Yorkist, 356.
- Latimer, John, Carmelite friar, 90, 91.
- Latimer, William, Lord, partisan of John of Gaunt, 3; dismissed by Richard II., 7.
- La Trémoille, favourite of Charles VII., 309, 310, 312.
- Leicester, parliament at, 238.
- Le Mans, disputes about, 340.
- Leulighem, conferences of, 87, 92, 124.
- Lewis of Bavaria, marries Blanche, daughter of Henry IV., 169.
- Litster, Geoffrey, "King of the Commons," 56, 60.
- Lollards, the, at Oxford, 68-78, 220-221; persecution of, 78; growth and activity of, 123; present petition to parliament, 128; persecution of, under Henry IV., 171, 208, 220-223; rising of, under Cobham, 237; under Perkins, 317; persecution of, under Henry V., 260, 267; under Edward IV., 470.
- London, Wat Tyler in, 37-50; riots in, 122; Jack Cade in, 349.
- Louis XI., King of France, aids Margaret of Anjou, 413; makes truce with Edward IV., 421, 425; allied to the Lancastrians, 430; aids Warwick, 438; treaty with England, 441; makes peace with Edward IV., 458; breaks with Edward, 467-468.
- Louis, son of Charles VI., Dauphin of France, 224, 241, 248; dies, 260.
- Lovel, Francis, Lord, partisan of Richard III., 476, 489, 490.
- Ludford, rout of, 383.
- Lumley, Ralph, Lord, conspires against Henry IV., 161; executed, 163.
- Luxemburg, John of, 295, 314, 319.
- Lyons, Richard, financier, 35; murdered by Tyler, 44.
- MacMurrough Art, King of Leinster, submits to Richard II., 127; rebels, 145-146.
- Maine, surrender of, 337-340.
- Manuel Palæologus, Emperor, visits England, 169.
- March, Edmund Mortimer, Earl of, opposes John of Gaunt, 1-2.
- March, Edmund, Earl of, heir to Richard II., 153; conspiracy in favour of, 180; escapes from Windsor, 193; release of, 233; reveals Cambridge's plot, 245; later plots for, 261, 294.
- March, George Dunbar, Earl of, aids Henry IV., 167.
- March, Roger, Earl of, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 128; slain at Kells, 146.
- Margaret of Anjou, queen of Henry VI., 334, 335; birth of her son, 361; supports Somerset, 361, 364; her rule, 371-379; raises army against York, 379-384; flies before battle of Northampton, 392; raises fresh army against York, 397; wins battle of Wakefield, 398; of St. Albans, 402, 403; flies to Scotland, 449; gets aid from Louis XI., 413; her forces dispersed, 414, 415; alliance of with Warwick, 437-440; lands in England, 445; imprisoned by Edward IV., 448; sold to France, 459.
- Margaret of York, marries Charles, Duke of Burgundy, 427-429, 431.
- Marshal, Thomas, Earl. See Nottingham.
- Mary of Burgundy, 461, 464, 467.
- Maximilian of Austria, 461, 464, 488.
- Meaux, taken by Henry V., 282; retaken by French, 329.
- Melun, taken by Henry V., 279.
- Merke, Thomas, Bishop of Carlisle, partisan of Richard II., 150; impeached, 158; deprived of his see, 160; conspires against Henry IV., 161; translated to see of Samosata, 164.
- Moleyns, Adam, Bishop of Chichester, 334; murdered, 343.
- Montereau, murder of John of Burgundy at, 275; taken by Henry V., 279; recovered by French, 328.

- Mortimer, Sir Edmund, captured by Glendower, 176; joins Glendower's rebellion, 178; besieged in Harlech and dies, 213. •
- Mortimer, Sir John, executed, 294.
- Mortimer, Sir Thomas, at Radcot Bridge, 108; outlawed, 140.
- Mortimer's Cross, battle of, 404.
- Morton, John, bishop of Ely, imprisoned by Richard III., 477, 478; conspires with Buckingham, 483, 486; in Brittany, 488; accompanies Henry of Richmond, 491.
- Mowbray, Anne, heiress of Norfolk, betrothed to Richard of York, 463; dies, 476.
- Mowbray, Thomas. See Nottingham.
- Mundeford, Osbern, 340, 389.
- Neville, family, Yorkists, 356.
- Neville, Anne. See Anne.
- Neville, George, chancellor, 394, 405; Archbishop of York, 423; dismissed by Edward IV., 428; again chancellor, 440, 443, 452.
- Neville, Sir Henry, raises rebellion in Yorkshire, 431-434.
- Neville, Sir Humphrey, beheaded by Warwick, 435.
- Neville, Isabel. See Clarence.
- Neville, John. See Montagu.
- Neville, Ralph. See Westmorland.
- Neville, Richard (1). See Salisbury.
- Neville, Richard (2). See Warwick.
- Neville, Roger, executed by Lancastrians, 390.
- Norfolk, John Howard, Duke of, partisan of Richard III., 476, 480; slain at Bosworth, 493-496.
- Norfolk, John Mowbray, Duke of, partisan of Humphrey of Gloucester and Richard of York, 298, 356, 362, 365, 386, 400, 405, 407-408.
- Norfolk, Thomas Mowbray, Duke of, Earl of Nottingham, 105; a Lord Appellant, 107; in favour with Richard, 131; takes part against Gloucester, Warwick and Arundel, 135; Duke of Norfolk, 137; his quarrel with Henry of Hereford, 141; banished, 143.
- Norham, siege of, 415.
- Northampton, parliament at, 299; battle of, 393.
- Northumberland, Henry Percy (1), Earl of, insults John of Gaunt, 65, 105, 106, 114, 146; joins Henry of Lancaster, 148, 166; victory at Homildon Hill, 177; rebels against Henry IV., 179; imprisoned and released, 183; rebellion of, 194-211; killed at Bramham Moor, 212.
- Northumberland, Henry (2), Earl of, killed at St. Albans, 365-367.
- Northumberland, Henry (3), Earl of, Lancastrian, 402, 407; slain at Towton, 408.
- Northumberland, Henry (4), Earl of, partisan of Richard III., 464; at Bosworth, 493.
- Northumberland, John Neville, Lord Montagu, Earl of, Yorkist, 406, 409; his northern campaign, 413-417; executes Robin of Holderness, 432; betrays Edward IV. and joins Warwick, 439, 442; slain at Barnet, 444, 445.
- North Walsham, combat at, 59-60.
- Nottingham, judges' opinions given at, 104, 109, 140.
- Nottingham, Thomas Mowbray, Earl Marshal, 193; joins rebellion against Henry IV., 194-196; executed, 197.
- Nottingham, Thomas Mowbray, Earl of. See Norfolk.
- Norwich, Litster's rebels at, 56-60.
- Oldcastle, Sir John. See Cobham.
- Oldhall, Sir William, Speaker, 351, 360, 385.
- Orleans, Charles, Duke of, 223; seeks English aid, 226-228; at Agincourt, 251; taken prisoner, 258, 284; released, 331, 334.
- Orleans, Dunois, bastard of. See Dunois.
- Orleans, Louis, Duke of, attacks the English, 183, 190; invades Guienne, 206; murdered, 211.
- Orleans, siege of, 302; Jeanne Darc at, 307.
- Ormond, James, Earl of, joins Richard II., 127.
- Ormond, James, Earl of. See Wiltshire.
- Oxford, John de Vere (1), Earl of, executed by Edward IV., 412.
- Oxford, John de Vere (2), Earl of, 441; at Barnet, 444; escapes to France, 449; seizes St. Michael's Mount, 449, 455; in Brittany, 448; accompanies Henry of Richmond, 491; at Bosworth, 494.
- Oxford, Robert de Vere, Earl of, favourite of Richard II., 89, 98, 101; attacked by Lords Appellant, 106; raises army for Richard, 107; flies from Radcot Bridge, 108; condemned by the "merciless parliament," 110; dies in exile, 113; buried at Colne, 133.
- Oxford, the Lollards at, 68-78, 220-221.
- Paris, siege and relief of, 223-224; massacres at, 268, 269; Henry V. enters, 279; attacked by Jeanne Darc, 310;

- Henry VI. crowned at, 316-317; recovered by the French, 326.
- Parliament, the "good," of 1376, 6; the "merciless," 109-112; the "unlearned," 190; the "long," 201, 207; "of bats," 299. See also Bury, Coventry, Gloucester, Leicester, Reading, Shrewsbury, Winchester.
- Pecock, Reginald, Bishop of Chichester, condemned for heresy, 377, 378.
- Pembroke, Jasper Tudor, Earl of, 404; Lancastrian commander, 416, 418, 430, 439, 440, 445, 449, 488, 491.
- Pembroke, William Herbert, Earl of, 376, 409, 424, 428; created earl by Edward IV., 430, 432; beheaded, 434.
- Percy. See Northumberland.
- Percy, Henry, "Hotspur," defeated and captured at Otterbourne, 115, 146; unsuccessfully resists Glendower, 166, 173; at Hornildon Hill, 177; rebels against Henry IV., 179; killed at Shrewsbury, 182.
- Percy, Sir Ralph, Lancastrian, 413, 414; slain at Hedgeley Moor, 416.
- Perkins, William, attempted rising of, 317.
- Perrers, Alice, banished, 8.
- Philippa, daughter of Edward IV., marries Eric of Denmark, 205.
- Philpot, John, London citizen, war-treasurer, 8, 14; his naval enterprise, 13; knighted at Smithfield, 48, 49.
- Pilleth, combat of, 176.
- Pisa, council of, 220.
- Plymouth, sacked by the French, 183.
- Pole, John de la, Earl of Lincoln, proclaimed heir to Richard III., 487.
- Pole, Michael de la. See Suffolk.
- Poll-tax, graduated, imposed by parliament of 1379, 17; the great, of 1381, 21; difficulties of its levy, 22-25.
- Pontefract, Richard II. imprisoned at, 158; murdered at, 165.
- Pontoise, sieges of, 275, 325, 327, 329.
- Portsmouth, conspiracy at, 245-246; Moleyns murdered at, 343.
- Portugal, at war with Castile, 5; makes peace, 87; secures independence by battle of Aljubarotta, 92. See João I. and Fernando.
- Præmunire, statute of, 121; protest of Pope Martin V. about, 301.
- Preachers, Wycliffe's poor, 73, 74.
- Provisors, papal, legislation against, 120; protests of Pope Martin V. about, 301.
- Purvey, John, Wycliffite, 79; recantation of, 171.
- Radcot Bridge, combat of, 108.
- Ratcliffe, Sir Richard, favourite of Richard III., 489; slain at Bosworth, 496.
- Ravenspur, Bolingbroke lands at, 147; Edward IV. lands at, 441.
- Reading, parliament at, 360.
- Rebellion, the great, of 1381, 26-64.
- Redesdale, Robin of (Sir John Conyers), 429, 432.
- Reims, Charles VII. crowned at, 309.
- Repyngdon, Philip, Wycliffite, 77; recants, 79.
- Richard II., his accession, 1, 2; dealings with Tyler's rebellion, 39-50; marries Anne of Bohemia, 66; his ministers and policy, 85, 89; his quarrels with Lancaster, 91, 93, 96; his Scottish war, 95, 96; quarrels with parliament, 98, 101, 103; opposed by Lords Appellant, 106-112; recalls Lancaster, 116; in Ireland, 125-128; marries Isabella of France, 129, 130; his revenge on the Lords Appellant, 133-137; his tyranny, 138; banishes Hereford and Norfolk, 143; confiscates Lancaster's estates, 145; in Ireland, 145-147; returns to meet Hereford's revolt, 148; flies to Wales, 149; abdicates, imprisoned in the Tower, 150; his death at Pontefract, 164.
- Richard III., Duke of Gloucester, 409; with Edward IV. in Burgundy, 440; at Barnet, 444; at Tewkesbury, 447; murders Henry VI., 449; marries Anne Neville, 452, 458; influence of, 463, 464; leads army against Scotland, 465, 466, 469, 472; seizes and imprisons Edward V., 474, 475; protector, 475; king, 480; murders the princes, 481; crushes Buckingham's conspiracy, 485; slain at Bosworth, 493-496.
- Richemont, Arthur, constable of France, 254, 258, 298, 343.
- Richmond, Henry Tudor, Earl of, 448-449; conspiracy in favour of, 483-485; in Brittany, 488; rises against Richard III., 492; wins battle of Bosworth, 493-496.
- Rivers, Anthony Woodville, Earl of, 464, 469; imprisoned by Richard III., 474; executed, 480.
- Rivers, Richard Woodville, Lord, father of Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV., 422, 428, 429; executed by Warwick, 435.
- Robert II., King of Scotland, 93, 94.
- Robert III., King of Scotland, 167, 203.
- Rokeby, Sir Thomas, defeats Northumberland at Bramham Moor, 212.

- Rotherham, Thomas, archbishop, chancellor, 459, 462; imprisoned by Richard III., 477, 478, 489.
- Rothsay, David, Duke of, 167, 173, 175.
- Rouen, siege of, 269-273; Jeanne Darc burnt at, 317; siege of, 318; recovered by French, 342.
- Roxburgh, sieges of, 327, 394.
- Rutland, Edmund, Earl of, son of Richard of York, 281; slain at Wakefield, 398.
- Rutland, Edward, Earl of. See York.
- Russell, John, Bishop of Lincoln, 473; chancellor of Richard III., 478.
- Rye, sacked by French, 6.
- Rygge, Robert, Chancellor of Oxford, upholds Wycliffe, 76; crushed by Arundel, 77.
- St. Albans, the rising of 1381 in, 51, 52; first battle of, 365-368; second battle of, 402.
- St. Cloud, battle of, 221.
- St. Denis, taken by the French, 321-322; recovered by the English, 325.
- St. Leger, Sir Thomas, beheaded by Richard III., 484, 485.
- St. Michael's Mount, Oxford besieged in, 449.
- St. Pol, Waleran, Count of, raids Isle of Wight, 186; defeated before Calais, 194.
- Salisbury, John Montagu, Earl of, one of Richard's Lords Appellants, 135; raises army for Richard, 149; impeached, 159; conspires against Henry IV., 161; executed, 163.
- Salisbury, Richard Neville, Earl of, in French war, 324; Yorkist partisan, 356; chancellor, 363, 364; at St. Albans, 365, 369; at Blore Heath, 380, 390, 392, 394; beheaded after Wakefield, 398.
- Salisbury, Thomas Montagu, Earl of, in the French war, 281, 291, 295, 297; slain, 301.
- Salisbury, William Montagu, Earl of, in rebellion of 1381, 38.
- Sandwich, sacked by the French, 375; seized by Yorkists, 389, 390.
- Sawtré, William, first Lollard martyr, 172.
- Say, James, Lord, beheaded by Cade, 349.
- Scales, Anthony Woodville, Lord. See Rivers.
- Scales, Thomas, Lord, captured by Jeanne Darc, 309; sacks Newbury, 385; besieged in the Tower, 392; murdered, 394.
- Scarle, John, chancellor of Henry IV., 166.
- Scotland. See under names of kings, Albany, Douglas, March, etc.
- Schism, the Great, 16, 209, 220, 243.
- Scrope of Bolton, John, Lord, Yorkist, 406, 408.
- Scrope of Bolton, Richard, Lord, chancellor of Richard II., 15; again chancellor, 63; dismissed, 81; defends Suffolk, 103.
- Scrope of Masham, Henry, Lord, plots against Henry V., 245, 246.
- Scrope, Richard, Archbishop of York, conspires against Henry IV., 180, 194; executed, 197.
- Scrope, Sir William. See Wiltshire.
- Shakel, John, seized in Westminster Abbey, 14; released, 16.
- Shaw, Dr., his political sermon, 478.
- Ship-money, protest of the Commons against, 170.
- Shore, Jane, 452, 477.
- Shrewsbury, parliament of, 139-140; battle of, 181-183.
- Shrewsbury, John Talbot, first earl, repulsed at Orleans, 307; taken prisoner, 309; commands English army, 319, 322, 328, 329, 332, 359; slain at Castillon, 360.
- Shrewsbury, John, second earl, Lancastrian, 371; slain at Northampton, 393.
- Shrewsbury, John, third Earl of, 399, 406.
- Sibley, Walter, alderman of London, aids Tyler, 39, 48, 51.
- Sigismund, Emperor, attempts to make peace between France and England, 262.
- Smithfield, meeting of Richard II. with rebels at, 45-48.
- Somerset, John Beaufort, first Earl of, legitimised by Richard II., 130; made Earl of Somerset, 135; one of Richard's Lords Appellant, 135; made Marquis of Dorset, 137; betrays Richard, 145; degraded to rank of earl, 159; in Wales, 184; dies, 218.
- Somerset, John Beaufort, first Duke of, present at Baugé, 281; supports Cardinal Beaufort, 328; commands in France, 333; dies, 334.
- Somerset, Edmund Beaufort, second Duke of, Count of Mortagne, taken prisoner at Baugé, 281; takes Harfleur, 328, 329; Marquis of Dorset, 333; duke, 340; fails to hold Normandy, 342-344, 350; his struggle against York, 351, 358; impeached, 362; restored by Henry VI., 364; slain at St. Albans, 367.

- Somerset, Edmund, fourth Duke of, at Barnet, 444; at Tewkesbury, 446; executed, 448.
- Somerset, Henry Beaufort, third Duke of, Lancastrian, 372; fails to take Calais, 387, 389, 394; joins Queen Margaret, 397, 398, 402, 407, 413; submits to Edward IV., 414; deserts him, 416; executed after Hexham, 417.
- Stacey, John, retainer of Clarence, executed, 461.
- Stafford, Edmund, Earl of, slain at Shrewsbury, 182.
- Stafford, Henry, Earl of, mortally wounded at St. Albans, 367.
- Stafford, Humphrey, Earl of. See Buckingham.
- Stafford, Sir Richard, murdered by Sir J. Holland, 95.
- Stafford of Southwick, Humphrey, Lord. See Devon.
- Stanley, Sir William, joins Henry Tudor, 491-493; at Bosworth, 495.
- Stanley, Thomas, Lord, 384, 406, 464; arrested by Richard III., 477; marries Lady Margaret Beaufort, 484; aids Henry Tudor, 491, 493; at Bosworth, 495-496.
- Statute *De heretico comburendo*, 171.
- Statute of Labourers, the, 15, 27, 31; re-enforced, 114.
- Stewart, Sir John, at Cravant, 291; killed at battle of the Herrings, 303.
- Straw, Jack, Tyler's lieutenant, hanged, 49.
- Sudbury, Simon, Archbishop of Canterbury, 14-16; chancellor, 18, 20, 21; imprisons John Ball, 36; murdered by rebels, 43; trial of Wycliffe before, 71.
- Suffolk, John de la Pole, Duke of, partisan of Richard III., 464, 476.
- Suffolk, Michael de la Pole, Earl of, councillor of Richard II., 67; chancellor, 68, 85; his policy, 87-92; created Earl of Suffolk, 95, attacked by parliament, 101; impeached, 102; attacked by Lords Appellant, 106; condemned by "merciless parliament," 110; dies in exile, 113.
- Suffolk, Michael de la Pole, second Earl of, slain at Agincourt, 257.
- Suffolk, William de la Pole, Duke of, attacks Orleans, 302; defeated by Jeanne Darc, 307, 334; makes peace with France, 335; surrenders Maine, 335, 340; impeached, 345; beheaded, 346.
- Surienne, Francisco, provokes war in Normandy, 341.
- Surrey, Thomas Holland, Earl of Kent, 135, 137; degraded from rank of duke, 159; conspires against Henry IV., 161; executed, 164.
- Swynford, Katharine, Duchess of Lancaster, 124.
- Talbot, Gilbert, Lord, defeats Welsh at Grosmont, 194.
- Talbot, John Lord. See Shrewsbury.
- Tanneguy Duchâtel, saves the dauphin, 268; murders John of Burgundy, 275; councillor of Charles VII., 289; dismissed, 298.
- Tewkesbury, battle of, 447.
- Thomas, Rhys ap, joins Richmond, 492.
- Thorpe, Thomas, Speaker, 369.
- Tiptoft, John, Lord. See Worcester.
- Toulangeon, Antoine, defends Rouen, 269; assists Bedford, 291.
- Touques, Henry V. lands at, 264, 265.
- Towton, battle of, 408.
- Tresham, William, Speaker, Yorkist, 346; murdered by Grey de Ruthyn, 351.
- Tressilian, chief justice, 50-52; signs the "opinions of Nottingham," 104; impeached and executed, 111.
- Trollope, Sir Andrew, betrays Warwick, 383; killed at Towton, 408.
- Troyes, treaty of, 277, 278.
- Tudor, Jasper. See Pembroke.
- Tudor, Owen, marries Katharine of France, 329; executed by Edward IV., 404.
- Tyler, Wat, leader of the great rebellion, 34, 35; enters London, 39; his domination and overthrow, 42-47.
- Tyrrell, Sir James, murders Edward V., 481; commands at Calais, 490.
- Twynhow, Ankaret, her trial, 461.
- Vaughan, Sir Thomas, executed by Richard III., 480.
- Vaurus, Bastard of, 282-285.
- Venables, Richard, executed by Bedford, 320.
- Vendôme, Louis, Count of, 254, 258, 331.
- Vere, Robert de. See Oxford.
- Verneuil, battle of, 295.
- Vienne, Jean de, French admiral, his raids, 6, 11, 94-96.
- Wainfleet, William of, Bishop of Winchester, Lancastrian chancellor, 371, 373.
- Wakefield, battle of, 398.
- Walden, Roger, Archbishop of Canterbury, 137; deposed by Henry IV., 150.

- Wales, Joan, Princess of, 2; favours Wycliffe, 3, 45, 48, 71; mediates between Richard II. and Lancaster, 94; death of, 95.
- Wales. See Glendower, Tudor, etc.
- Walworth, William, war-treasurer, 8, 15, 37, 41; slays Wat Tyler, 47-49.
- Warde, Thomas, of Trumpington, impostor, 175.
- Warwick, Edward, Earl of, son of Clarence, 463; adopted, then disavowed by Richard III., 487.
- Warwick, Richard Beauchamp, Earl of, in French wars, 243, 268, 283, 297, 300, 301; commands army in France, 328; dies, 329.
- Warwick, Richard Neville, Earl of, "the king-maker," 356, 363; at battle of St. Albans, 366; captain of Calais, 369; his naval command, 374, 375; at rout of Ludford, 383; escapes to Calais, 387; in Ireland, 388; enters London, 391; wins battle of Northampton, 392, 393, 399; defeated at St. Albans, 402; seizes London, 404; at Towton, 408; his campaigns in the north, 409-415; his embassies to France, 421, 424, 427; his breach with Edward IV., 425, 431-433; takes Edward prisoner, 434; flies to France, 437; allies himself to Queen Margaret, 437; reconquers England, 439-440; defeated and slain at Barnet, 444-445.
- Warwick, Thomas Beauchamp, Earl of, guardian of Richard II., 18; Lord Appellant, 105, 112; arrested, 134; tried and imprisoned, 136-137.
- Welles, Richard, Lord, imprisoned, 436; executed, 437.
- Welles, Sir Robert, raises Lincolnshire rebellion, 436-437.
- Wenlock, John, Lord, Speaker, 469; attainted, 385; captures Sandwich, 389, 409; partisan of Warwick, 445; slain at Tewkesbury, 447.
- Westminster Abbey, pollution of, 13-15.
- Westmorland, Ralph Neville, Earl of, leads expedition to help King of Navarre, 12; joins Henry of Lancaster, 148, 160; marshal, 166; arrests Scrope and Mowbray, 196; warden of the marches, 243.
- Westmorland, Ralph, second Earl of, Lancastrian, 357.
- Whittington, Richard, mayor of London, 205.
- Winchester, parliament at, 341.
- Wight, Isle of, ravaged by French, 6; French repelled in, 185.
- Willoughby, Robert, Lord, surrenders Paris, 326.
- Wiltshire, James Butler, Earl of, Lancastrian, 361, 364, 367, 373, 379, 404, executed, 409.
- Wiltshire, Richard Scrope, Earl of, 135, 137, 146; executed, 149.
- Woodville, family of, their advancement under Edward IV., 424. See under Elizabeth, Queen; Rivers, and Scales.
- Woodville, Sir Edward, flies to France, 474; joins Richmond, 491.
- Woodville, Sir John, his marriage, 424; executed by Warwick, 434, 435.
- Woodville, Lionel, Bishop of Salisbury, 424; rebels against Richard III., 484.
- Worcester, John Tiptoft, Earl of, constable, 412, 417, 437; executed, 440; his learning, 469.
- Worcester, Thomas Percy, Earl of, 50, 137, 146, 149, 166; joins conspiracy against Henry IV., 180; beheaded, 183.
- Wraw, John, leader of revolt in East Anglia, 53-60.
- Wycliffe, John, his influence, 3, 15, 71; attempt of bishops to censure him, 13, 69; his views on the privilege of sanctuary, 15, 54; his life and teaching, 68-70; his trial at Lambeth, 71; translates the Bible, 73; founds the "poor preachers," 73; inhibited, 75; condemned by synod of Blackfriars, 76, 78; disapproves the Flemish crusade, 84; death, 80.
- Wykeham, William of, Bishop of Winchester, 1, 2; chancellor, 116; resigns, 121; death, 192.
- Yonge, Thomas, Yorkist, 352, 356.
- York, riots in, 61.
- York, Edmund, of Langley, Duke of, takes expedition to Portugal, 19; made Duke of York, 95; regent, 127, 146; joins Lancaster, 149; reveals conspiracy against Henry IV., 162.
- York, Edward, Duke of, Earl of Rutland, Duke of Aumerle, 137, 146; impeached and degraded from rank of duke, 158, 159; conspires against Henry IV., 161; reveals the conspiracy, 162; his campaigns in Wales, 190-209; takes part in Lady Despenser's plot, 193; at Agincourt, 253; slain, 257.
- York, Edward, Duke of. See Edward IV.
- York, Richard, Duke of, 295; commands army in France, 325, 327, 329, 339; in Ireland, 340; his return, 351;

struggle with Somerset, 351-358 ; supported by Nevilles, 356 ; protector, 363 ; takes arms against Henry VI., 364 ; wins battle of St. Albans, 366-367 ; intrigues of Queen Margaret against, 371, 379 ; at rout of Ludford, 381, 383 ; attainted, 385 ; in Ireland, 386 ; claims the throne, 395 ; slain at Wakefield, 398.

York, Richard, Duke of, son of Edward IV., 460 ; takes sanctuary at Westminster, 474 ; seized by Richard III., 478 ; murdered, 481.


Ypres, siege of, 85.



LAND AND WALES

UNDER THE
USE OF LANCASTER

Statute Miles
0 20 40 60































101006710046

DA

235

06

cop.3

Wallace
Room

Oman, (Sir) Charles William Chadwick
The history of England from the
accession of Richard II to the death of
Richard III.

WALLACE ROOM

DATE

NAME OF BORROWER

University of Toronto
Library

E

WALLACE ROOM

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW



D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 09 04 11 11 006 3